



**United Nations  
Environment  
Programme**



UNEP(DEC)/MED 188/4  
19 March 2002

Original: ENGLISH



---

---

**MEDITERRANEAN ACTION PLAN**

Seventh Meeting of the Mediterranean Commission  
on Sustainable Development (MCSD)

Antalya, 13-16 March, 2002

**REPORT OF THE SEVENTH MEETING OF THE  
MEDITERRANEAN COMMISSION ON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT  
(MCSD)**

## Table of Contents

### Body of the report

#### ANNEXES

- ANNEX I List of Participants
- ANNEX II Agenda of the meeting
- ANNEX III Record of decisions of the Seventh Meeting of the Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development (MCSD)
- ANNEX IV Recommendations related to MCSD Assessment and Prospects  
Appendix I: Summary of Conclusions and Recommendations  
Appendix II: Task force on MCSD Assessment and Prospects: Mandate
- ANNEX V Opening Speeches  
Appendix I Opening Speech of H.E. Mr. B. Fautirer, Plenipotentiary Minister, Monaco  
Appendix II Opening Speech of H.E. Mr. F. Aytakin, Minister of Environment, Turkey  
Appendix III Opening Speech of Mr. L. Chabason, Coordinator, UNEP/MAP
- ANNEX VI Report from the meeting of the MCSD Major Groups

## **Introduction**

1. The MCSD held its Seventh Meeting at the Sheraton Voyager Hotel in Antalya (Turkey) from 13 to 16 March 2002 following the decision to postpone the meeting originally scheduled to be held there from 3 to 6 October 2001 due to the international context and its impacts on the region. The meeting was held at the kind invitation and with the support of the Turkish Government.

## **Attendance**

2. The meeting was attended by the following 27 members of the Commission: Albania, Algeria, AIFM, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Municipality of Calvia, EOAEN, Croatia, Egypt, ENDA Maghreb, France, Greece, IME, Israel, Italy, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malta, MEDCOAST, MEDENER, MEDFORUM, Monaco, Morocco, Slovenia, Spain, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Turkey and WWF.

3. The following Regional Activity Centres and other components of MAP also attended the meeting: MED POL, BP/RAC, ERS/RAC, PAP/RAC, SPA/RAC, 100 Historic Sites.

4. The following other parties and organizations attended the meeting as observers: Palestinian Authority, IUCN, FOE/MEDNET, RAED, ICC/EDC and the Mediterranean University of Antalya

5. A full list of participants (in which the acronyms are spelt out in full) can be found in Annex I to this report.

## **Agenda item 1: Opening of the meeting**

6. H.E. Mr F. Aytakin, Minister for the Environment of Turkey, expressed his Government's pleasure to be hosting the Seventh Meeting of the MCSD and welcomed the participants. In the context of the increasing importance of sustainable development, and specifically of environmental issues, on the international agenda, the MCSD played a crucial role in integrating national and regional approaches to sustainable development in the Mediterranean, providing a sound institutional framework for environment and development policies and their follow-up, and influencing future priorities as they affected the Mediterranean. Turkey welcomed recent moves to strengthen the MCSD's position and institutional capabilities, stressing the need for support from, notably, international financial institutions to that end and the importance of representative membership. Improved cooperation with other relevant national and regional actors, international organizations and NGOs was essential for the implementation of the MCSD's activities. The MCSD would be playing an important role in preparations for the forthcoming World Summit for Sustainable Development (WSSD), and its subsequent action, taken in cooperation with other international organizations, should reflect the decisions of the Summit. He reiterated Turkey's interest in establishing a Regional Activity Centre on eco-tourism in Antalya. Tourism came squarely within the sustainable development agenda and Turkey, encompassing as it did three biogeographical regions, was ideally placed to host such a centre.

7. H.E. Mr B. Fautrier, Minister Plenipotentiary for Monaco and outgoing President of the MCSD, said that the MCSD found itself at the beginning of a necessarily slow process which, like any human undertaking, was unlikely to be perfect from the outset. While some important themes with which the MCSD had dealt and some of its recommendations had not yet been adequately implemented, that was no justification for doubting the effectiveness of its work as a think tank or for overburdening and overcomplicating its structures. Emphasis

on the follow-up of its proposals should not be at the expense of its capacity for innovation. The voice of the Mediterranean region had to be heard loudly and clearly at the WSSD, both by governments and representatives of civil society. After Johannesburg, factors would emerge which would enable a genuine Mediterranean strategy for sustainable development to be established more effectively. To achieve this objective it was vital to step outside the confines of the environmental framework, and for the representatives of economic entities and local communities to play a genuinely active part. One of the MCSD's main tasks at the present meeting would be to continue with work which was already underway, such as the theme of free trade and the environment, to select new issues, and bearing in mind the importance for the region of questions relating to tourism to give them special attention.

8. Mr L. Chabason, MAP Coordinator, thanked the Turkish authorities on behalf of the Secretariat for their warm welcome and for the essential role they had played in the organization of the meeting. Antalya was not only Turkey's most important region for tourism, but it also provided a good example of the sustainable development issues of the Mediterranean region. The meeting was of particular significance in that it followed the 12<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Contracting Parties, held in Monaco in November 2001, and preceded the WSSD, to be held in Johannesburg from 26 August to 6 September 2002. It thus provided an opportunity to take stock and review the Commission's methods of work, as well as to give consideration to the perspectives of the process towards sustainable development in the Mediterranean region. The MCSD was a unique innovation: the Mediterranean was the only region to have such a multi-stakeholder instrument for cooperation. It had been said that the WSSD would enhance regional cooperation; in fact the MCSD had been a pioneer in precisely that endeavour. It was one component of a global effort to shape a completely new vision of the very complex problems of sustainable development, and it was the beginning of a long process.

#### **Agenda item 2: Election of the Steering Committee**

9. In accordance with rule 17 of the Rules of Procedure and following the customary consultations, the Commission elected its new Steering Committee, the President of the Bureau of the Contracting Parties (Monaco) being a member *ex officio*. The composition of the Steering Committee was as follows:

President:	H.E. Mr F. Aytekin	(Turkey)
Vice-Presidents:	H.E. Mr B. Fautrier	(Monaco)
	Mr J. Echirk	(Algeria)
	Mr V. Escobar	(Spain)
	Ms M. Najera Aranzabal	(Municipality of Calvia)
	Mr A. Benhallou	(MEDENER)
Rapporteur	Mr M. Ibrahim	(ENDA)

#### **Agenda item 3: Adoption of the agenda and organization of work**

10. Mr Hoballah, MAP Deputy Coordinator, outlined the provisional agenda and explained that the Secretariat/Expert report on MCSD Assessment and Prospects would be presented in its entirety by the Secretariat because Mr Nikos Georgiades, the representative of Cyprus and author of the report, was unable to attend on account of ill health. The provisional agenda was adopted.

11. Following a request for information concerning members of the Commission who were not present at the meeting, the members of the MCSD expressed concern at the absence of several members including the European Community from such an important meeting. A letter explaining Ecs reasons was received during the meeting. Following a

discussion, it was agreed that the Steering Committee would convey a written message to the European Commission acknowledging the importance of the contribution made by the European Commission to the promotion of sustainable development in the region, particularly in view of the current important developments in the Euro-Mediterranean partnership, the development of regional sustainable development strategies and the need to develop convergent perspectives in view of the imminence of the WSSD, but noting the absence of a representative of the Commission at the present meeting.

**Agenda item 4: MCSD assessment and prospects**

12. Mr Hoballah introduced the summary of the conclusions and recommendations of the assessment report contained in Annex I of document UNEP(DEC)/MED WG.188/2. After reviewing the issues raised in the assessment, he recalled that although the MCSD had succeeded in increasing its visibility during the five years since its inception through its activities and meetings, several members had expressed the view that its effectiveness needed to be improved. At the 12<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Contracting Parties, several Ministers and heads of delegations, as well as partners, had expressed general satisfaction with the MCSD's achievements, but most had raised concerns regarding its performance and the need for greater resources to achieve its objectives. There should be more cooperation between partners and more effective participation generally with a view to generating more strategic proposals and identifying measures for implementing its recommendations.

13. To prepare for the current discussion, all MCSD members and MAP components had been requested to submit their views on the assessment of the MCSD's activities and prospects. A number of weaknesses had been identified. For example, there was a common perception that the MCSD's report-producing function dominated its work, to the detriment of its role as an open and autonomous think tank and forum for dialogue. It was also widely felt that too much emphasis was placed on environmental considerations to the detriment of the social and economic dimensions of sustainable development. Other areas of concern related to the apparent lack of commitment of some of the partners, the need to increase awareness of sustainable development through a clear strategy, and budgetary and staff limitations which hampered the MCSD's output. Among the MCSD's strengths, it was recognized that its pluralism and participatory approach made it a unique regional forum for dialogue and for promoting sustainable development strategies.

14. In the discussion that followed, all the speakers paid tribute to the quality of the report prepared by Mr Georgiades. They emphasized that this was a crucial moment, ten years after Rio, and with the WSSD imminent, to be looking at the question of the effectiveness, achievements, mandate, membership and methods of work of the MCSD. It was important for the MCSD to be sufficiently flexible to adapt to the post-Johannesburg requirements of sustainable development and it was a healthy initiative for it to take stock of what had been achieved with a view to remedying its shortcomings and strengthening the MCSD for the future. However, if the failings of the MCSD were to be effectively resolved, its members would first need to agree among themselves on what the problems were. In this respect, several speakers argued for greater flexibility in the MCSD's methods of work and against the establishment of rigid, permanent structures.

15. Several speakers emphasized that one of the root problems faced by the MCSD was the fact that sustainable development was in itself difficult to define. It was therefore hardly surprising that the MCSD should be facing problems in identifying its precise role and means of action. Sustainable development was a process, rather than a product, and this process needed to be promoted at the regional, national and local levels, particularly through the mainstreaming of environmental and social aspects into economic decision-making, the development of a participatory process involving actors at all levels and the creation of partnerships. The MCSD did achieve important progress but it was felt that it still needed to

improve the effectiveness of its participatory approach. In this respect, the main question was how such processes were to be improved and reflected in a comprehensive approach.

16. It was agreed that the MCSD was still unique in its structure, with its inclusion of environmental and development NGOs, local authorities and socio-economic actors, even though a similar partnership had now been developed in the Baltic in the context of Baltic 21. While its composition constituted its main strength, it had to be acknowledged that the MCSD as a whole, in the same way as UNCSD, remained focused much more on the environment than on the social, economic, political, financial and structural aspects of sustainable development. For its recommendations to achieve a greater level of effectiveness, it was necessary to broaden its dialogue with other partners, particularly through the involvement in its work of representatives of economic and social ministries, backed up by experts in the various fields and collaboration with other competent regional and international organizations.

17. With regard to the membership of the MCSD, care needed to be taken to ensure that its members from civil society represented the broadest possible interests, and that the danger was averted of them being chosen from a small "club" of interested organizations. While it was relatively easy to find candidates for membership among environmental NGOs, more problems arose with regard to the participation and commitment of local authorities and socio-economic actors. In order to achieve adequate representation and involvement by the groups concerned, it would be necessary to define the required profiles of members, particularly the socio-economic actors, which currently did not represent the broad spectrum of potential MCSD partners in that category, such as trade unions, federations of professional organizations and consumers. A more proactive approach was also needed in seeking out potential candidates through a process which might be termed "marketing and promotion" among the actors concerned. There was general agreement that the potential of MCSD members was not being fully tapped: the experience of individuals should be shared more widely, perhaps via an Internet site.

18. It was also emphasized that one of the major concerns of the MCSD lay in the lack of follow-up and implementation of its findings and recommendations, even when they had been approved by the Contracting Parties. It was very important in this respect to improve the visibility and credibility of the MCSD by ensuring that its work achieved greater effect in practice. Greater efforts should therefore be made to ensure that recommendations were accompanied by practical suggestions and guidance for their implementation and to publish and disseminate its work on a regular basis, including through the mass media. One of the most effective means of extending its impact consisted of strengthening links with national commissions for sustainable development, where they existed, and through other national information dissemination activities, such as the production of information materials on sustainable development issues. Every effort should be made to establish or strengthen national commissions for sustainable development. It was also vital to promote the implementation of pilot projects based on the MCSD's recommendations, either at the national level or in the form of subregional and bilateral cooperation projects, in which MAP should play a more active role. Such activities and partnerships would increase national and local commitment to sustainable development issues. Mechanisms such as voluntary or bilateral agreements for the implementation of proposals, as well as voluntary compliance monitoring, were also effective means of improving the impact of recommendations.

19. Several speakers said that the MCSD should use its coordinating role to give more support to regional and subregional cooperation on issues of common concern, and specifically to South-South cooperation. One speaker proposed that the MCSD should seize the opportunity to exchange experience with the Baltic 21 grouping, which might have useful inter-ministerial experience, while another said that arrangements were being made for a meeting with the Baltic 21 countries in Spain on the subject of chemicals, which could

incorporate a specific agenda item on its sustainable development aspects and associate the MCSD with this initiative.

20. A number of speakers said that the summary of conclusions and recommendations should contain a separate chapter on information, communication, visibility and awareness raising. The visibility and credibility of the MCSD would be improved if it addressed issues that were recognized as being of broad importance and that were high on the international agenda, such as climate change. While several speakers added that greater visibility would help in the mobilization of funds, one argued that the MCSD's greater visibility should be within the context of a more visible MAP.

21. A number of speakers added that it was also necessary to clarify the ambiguity in the relationship between MAP and the MCSD. For example, many MAP Focal Points were also their country's members of the MCSD. In this context, greater impetus should be given to the strategic assessment of the general structures of the Barcelona Convention, which had been agreed to by the Contracting Parties in Monaco. While the value of the role played by the Regional Activity Centres in the work of the MCSD was widely acknowledged, it was also pointed out that the centres needed to be involved throughout the work of the MCSD and MAP, from the development of recommendations to the provision of support for their implementation.

22. On the question of the additional financial resources needed for the work of the MCSD, the importance of the sponsorship of activities and meetings by the Contracting Parties was acknowledged, although it was recognized that further action needed to be taken to attract support from donors, perhaps in the form of voluntary contributions. It was also widely felt that more human resources should be allocated within MAP structures to the work of the MCSD.

23. It was agreed that a task force of the MCSD should be established to examine ways in which the MCSD could be strengthened and its action refocused in the post-Johannesburg era. The task force should take into account developments in other regions and prepare comprehensive proposals. Terms of reference for the task force, prepared by Italy and Spain in collaboration with the Secretariat, are attached as Annex IV, Appendix II.

24. At the conclusion of the discussion, the meeting agreed upon a revised version of the summary of conclusions and recommendations incorporating the comments made during the discussion, and reworded in language more suitable to a text intended for wide distribution. This revised version is attached as Annex IV, Appendix I.

#### **Agenda item 5: Assessment of implementation and follow-up of MCSD recommendations and proposals for action**

25. Introducing the report on this subject (Annex II of document UNEP(DEC)/MED WG.188/2), Mr Hoballah said that it was the outcome of a broad consultation process and pilot studies related to themes which had already been covered by the MCSD. The contents of the report had been analysed and discussed at last November's Extraordinary Meeting of the MCSD and its recommendations had been approved by the Contracting Parties in Monaco. The MCSD was expected to further discuss this issue and find ways to implement them. The recommendations to the Contracting Parties included improving communications, preparing national plans, promoting twinning projects and using other instruments and means of implementation. The recommendations to the Secretariat called for the preparation of specific guidelines, assistance in disseminating information and improving communication, and the assessment every four years of how the recommendations were being implemented.

26. Several speakers emphasized that the implementation and follow-up of the MCSD's recommendations were vital to its effectiveness, credibility and visibility. In the context of the MCSD, it was important to develop voluntary mechanisms, where possible based on indicators, to help the Contracting Parties ensure that they were adequately fulfilling their commitments. Certain countries, including Croatia and Slovenia, had experimented with practical measures in this respect. In all such measures it was essential to involve other partners and decision-makers who were closely involved in the areas covered by the MCSD's recommendations, including ministries responsible for planning, municipal and local authorities. The involvement of civil society in general was also of great importance if the MCSD's recommendations were to have a real impact. Finally, it was recalled that initiatives should be launched for the financing and implementation of practical activities, particularly in fields that were important for sustainable development but in which little action had yet been taken. The example was cited of a trust fund established at the initiative of Italy and set up to promote the use of renewable sources of energy through UNEP.

27. With regard to the recommendations to the Secretariat adopted by the Contracting Parties in Monaco, several proposals were made to contribute to their implementation. Mr Benoit, the Director of the Blue Plan, provided information on follow-up activities which had been undertaken and were planned to assist in the implementation of recommendations in such fields as water and indicators. It would also be very beneficial for Mediterranean countries to cooperate in providing expertise and support for the design and implementation of pilot projects and practical measures. Additional proposals included the placing of information on the MCSD's activities on national web sites concerned with the environment and sustainable development, as well as the preparation of national brochures.

28. During a brief discussion in which it was pointed out that there were often shortcomings in the flow of information back to the national level from bodies such as the MCSD, it was agreed that regional thematic forums should be organized in the context of the MCSD for those responsible at the national level in the various fields covered by its recommendations, as well as other concerned actors. Such regional forums should then be followed up by further activities within countries to ensure that a large number of stakeholders were aware of the MCSD's guidance and recommendations and were involved in their implementation. It was agreed that this methodology should be first tested in the field of tourism, which was of immense importance in the region and where little had yet been done to follow-up the MCSD's recommendations. It was also pointed out that activities of this type covering tourism would be very appropriate in Antalya and its surrounding areas.

**Agenda item 6: "Framework orientations" for a Mediterranean strategy for sustainable development**

29. Introducing the agenda item, Mr Hoballah recalled that the terms of reference of the MCSD included the provision of assistance to the Contracting Parties in formulating and implementing a regional sustainable development strategy. The MCSD was now called upon to engage in the formulation of such a strategy, based on the preliminary steps already undertaken, including the strategic review and the compilation of significant background information. Despite the increased challenges in the region, it could not be denied that sustainable development considerations still had no real and obvious influence on policy-making, which was still dominated by the issues of globalization and the need to achieve economic efficiency. The current task principally required a political and institutional analysis of how a process of smooth transition to sustainable development could be achieved. The formulation of a regional strategy on sustainable development would therefore be a good test case of the emergence of good governance processes and would undoubtedly require far-reaching structural changes in all sectors, including the reform of fiscal policies, the integration of environmental considerations in development policies and a re-orientation and increase in public and private investment in achieving sustainable development. To be



effective, in view of the breadth of the subject, such a strategy would need to focus on a small number of issues related, for example, to severe or irreversible threats, the well-being of the people and regional cooperation, welcoming the Euro-Mediterranean partnership and initiatives covering eastern Mediterranean countries.

30. He recalled that at its previous meeting the MCSD had agreed that the Secretariat should work with a small number of experts and that a workshop of concerned experts from all the members, partners and observers would be held in October 2002 with the support of the Spanish Government. A preliminary version of the strategy should be prepared for the Eighth Meeting of the MCSD and it was hoped that a first draft of the strategy could be submitted to the Contracting Parties at their Thirteenth Meeting in Catania in 2003.

31. Mr Benoit reported that the Blue Plan was engaged, with the support of the European Environment Agency, in producing a new report on the situation with regard to environment and development in the Mediterranean region, as a follow-up to the previous report, which had been published in 1989. The new report would build on the work carried out by the MCSD for the development of indicators for sustainable development in the region and on other issues. Despite the work carried out and the positive response from Mediterranean countries in this respect, there were still weaknesses in knowledge of the situation. Under the guidance of a small steering committee, the report would not engage in the development of various prospective scenarios, as the previous one had done, but would focus on the current situation in the region and the main trends. The first chapter would provide an overview of major developments in terms of sustainable development in the region, based on existing indicators. The second would highlight the expected developments over the next 25 years, particularly in terms of population growth and movements and major economic developments. The third chapter would concentrate on such subjects as water and energy, urbanization and waste, agriculture and rural development, tourism, transport and trade, with a view to showing the impact that developments in these fields would have in the region, the areas in which environmental pressure would increase the most and responses that were emerging for sustainable development (good practices). In this respect, an effort would be made to obtain coastal indicators in addition to national indicators. The final chapter would provide conclusions and a synthetic overview, which should be of assistance in developing the Mediterranean strategy for sustainable development. It was planned to prepare the draft report for the summer of 2003.

32. In a brief discussion, the hope was expressed that the report by the Blue Plan would assist in the development of a Mediterranean strategy for sustainable development, and that the work on the strategy would not duplicate that of the Blue Plan. It was also hoped that the report would emphasize the idea that measures which supported sustainable development did not normally constitute an additional cost, but that they actually involved savings, such as in the case of the sustainable use of water. It was also pointed out that work on related subjects was being undertaken in a number of countries, the results of which could be used in the report prepared by the Blue Plan. For example, a project to quantify the cost of environmental degradation, financed by the World Bank, had been undertaken in Algeria, Egypt and Tunisia.

33. In a discussion of the methodology to be adopted and the guiding criteria for the formulation of a Mediterranean strategy for sustainable development, several speakers emphasized the major challenge involved in developing a common and comprehensive strategy for the region as a whole. Certain speakers pointed to a certain confusion in the use of such terms as "orientations", "framework" and "strategies". It was emphasized in this context that the overall objective needed to be the achievement of a change in the institutional processes through which sustainable development was generated. This meant that the primary emphasis would have to be placed on governance, since Ministries of the Environment would clearly not be powerful enough on their own to bring about the necessary

change. It would therefore be necessary to bring sustainable development into the institutional structures through which decision-makers ranging from finance ministries through to other actors at the national and local levels, made decisions affecting the development of their countries. The important actors, such as ministries of finance were already well organized in their own sectors, for example through the WTO, and it was therefore essential to mainstream sustainable development in those structures. In this respect, it was also pointed out that governance structures, as illustrated by the recent UNEP Cartagena meeting on Global Environmental Governance, had undergone a perceptible change in view of recent world events which would need to be fully taken into account. Great care should also be taken to ensure that any strategy on sustainable development was not confined to sectoral environmental interests, but dealt with all the important issues underpinning sustainable development. In this regard, the measurement of development needed to go well beyond performance in terms of GDP. The three key pillars proposed were therefore appropriate, although it would be necessary to look more closely at the components of each pillar.

34. Several speakers placed emphasis on the need for the MCSD, in its work on the formulation of a sustainable development strategy in the region, to take fully into account similar work being undertaken within and outside the region, such as the European sustainable development strategy and the planned strategy of the Euro-Mediterranean partnership, as well as specific Mediterranean issues, including South-South relations, Mediterranean values and culture, and the promotion of social solidarity. An effective strategy would need to be based on the development of an efficient interface with the relevant bodies and programmes, without falling into the trap of duplicating work being carried out elsewhere. In this respect, it was recalled that work on the three key pillars proposed should give sufficient importance to the function of information in gaining greater visibility for the MCSD and MAP.

35. A number of speakers said that the MCSD would need to be more specific in setting out its methodology and criteria for the formulation of the Mediterranean strategy for sustainable development. The Strategic Action Programme, although focusing on more limited environmental issues, provided a good example of a concrete programme which set firm and clear objectives to be achieved by 2025. The strategy for sustainable development should therefore contain identifiable components and measurable objectives. It would also be pragmatic to place emphasis on a bottom-up approach, focusing on real common problems, such as the management of water demand and the development of clean production methods.

36. In this context, it was agreed that the holding of an expert meeting in October in Spain to prepare the orientations based on the three key pillars by applying the proposed methodology was a sound way to establish a coherent framework, a detailed table of contents and a related agenda for the formulation of a Mediterranean strategy for sustainable development, with a view to preparing a brief preliminary draft taking into account other relevant initiatives for submission to the Eighth Meeting of the MCSD.

#### **Agenda item 7: Tourism and sustainable development: A regional programme**

37. Dr T. Neyisci, Director of the Center for Ecological Studies, Mediterranean University of Antalya (MU), gave a presentation of the objectives, structure and staffing of a proposed MAP Regional Activity Centre/Eco-Tourism (RAC/ET) in Antalya, Turkey. He said that the impact of tourism on the environment was usually regarded as negative, but that it could also be positive. Tourism, or as he preferred to call it "eco-tourism", had to be used to promote conservation and sustainable development. The Mediterranean University, which was willing to be a part of the RAC/ET project, would prepare a dossier for discussion by the MCSD at future meetings.

38. Many members welcomed the proposal, but a number of them considered it unbalanced, placing too much emphasis on studies, analyses and the preparation of reports, all of which were already being done elsewhere, and too little on the need to train and build the capacities of a new generation in the tourism industry so that attitudes could be changed towards managing Mediterranean tourism in such a way that it was sustainable. Many felt that the term “eco-tourism” was ill-defined and too narrow. There was a general belief that mechanisms should be developed that would promote the contribution of tourism to sustainable development, including that of mass tourism, which all too frequently had a predominantly negative environmental impact, especially on coastal areas which were developed in a “boom and bust” manner that in the end killed off the value of tourism. It was important to encourage tourism that left a less negative impact. One speaker said that since mass tourism put such great pressure on the rural and agricultural environment, eco-tourism should be encouraged to develop the use of archaeological and natural sites.

39. Many speakers warned against duplicating the work already being done on related subjects by BP/RAC and PAP/RAC. One speaker said that, as agreed at the last MAP National Focal Points Meeting, the proposal should not be for a RAC, but for a programme or a network which was closely associated with professionals in the tourist industry. Another said that, while Turkey should continue with its initiative, the proposal had to be placed in the context of MAP and the other RACs; he requested the Secretariat to undertake an assessment of the initiative as part of the MAP structure and in the context of what had already been decided by the Contracting Parties.

40. Mr Chabason said that Turkey should certainly be encouraged to develop its initiative. The Contracting Parties were not yet ready to establish a new RAC, but there was room for a programme, and the MCSD could encourage such a programme on tourism in sustainable development. The programme could be implemented over a two-year period. The Turkish proposal, however, needed to be fine-tuned and fleshed out in accordance with previous work by the MCSD and views expressed. There was a clear need to address the issue of tourism, which was even more serious than the projection by BP/RAC that the number of tourists in Mediterranean coastal areas would increase from 180 million today to 300 million by 2025. This programme, however, would need to consider tourism in the overall context of sustainable development, and not just restrict itself from the beginning to “eco-tourism”.

41. The representative of Turkey agreed that the initiative would be implemented first as a programme that her Government would support, but that at a later stage it would be important to receive support from MAP and other concerned partners.

42. Dr Neyisci said in conclusion that tourism in Turkey had done much that was positive, both for socio-economic life and for conservation. There had been a good deal of talk about definitions, but they had to be agreed by all countries and actors. Cooperation with other RACs was very important, and the Turkish programme now and in the future would definitely have to work closely with the concerned actors in the region, and in particular with MAP components. The term “eco-tourism” had been chosen because it placed emphasis on training at all levels; it was in many ways the response to mass tourism, taking it away from the beaches into the hills and plains behind, thereby spreading tourism revenue to broader sections of the population.

43. It was finally agreed that Turkey would review its proposals for the development of a programme on tourism and sustainable development, giving due consideration to the comments made by the MCSD, with a view to presenting a more detailed proposal to the next meeting of the MCSD so that it could make its recommendations to the Contracting Parties for a final decision on this issue.

**Agenda item 8: Historic sites and sustainable development**

44. Mr L. Chabason, referring to the introductory note prepared by one of the experts who was involved in the evaluation of the Historic Sites Programme and contained in section VIII of document UNEP(DEC)/MED WG.188/3, noted that, at their 12<sup>th</sup> Ordinary Meeting and following an evaluation of the 100 Historic Sites Programme, the Contracting Parties had requested the Secretariat to prepare, using the MCSD framework as appropriate, a draft of a new programme on cultural heritage. He drew attention to the points which would form the basis for the programme, namely: heritage in danger; heritage protection and land use planning; sustainable heritage management; and the contribution of the heritage to sustainable development. He stressed the importance of retaining the theme of cultural heritage as a component of sustainable development in the Mediterranean. In order to establish such a programme, MAP suggested that the MCSD consider setting up a working group that would be co-chaired by two members of the Commission and include other members who were fully representative of the MCSD and who might designate experts in cultural heritage. Funding would have to be found for the working group, which would then meet once in 2002 and once early in 2003 with a view to presenting its report to the MCSD in April 2003.

45. In the ensuing discussion, a consensus emerged that, in order to avoid overlap with work already being done in other forums, the focus of the programme should be on the cultural heritage rather than the natural heritage, and that it should be set clearly in the context of sustainable development. It was suggested that the new programme should build upon the existing, non-exhaustive network of historic sites.

46. The idea of setting up a working group was endorsed, as was that of North-South co-chairmanship. It was considered important for the group to be representative of all MCSD members. A proposal to link the theme of cultural heritage with that of tourism proposed by Turkey, and to combine the two themes in the mandate of the working group, was widely approved.

47. Regarding the thrust of programme activities, several speakers stressed the need to adopt a consistent, integrated approach, to address the issues relating to cultural heritage and tourism in their broader social, economic and political context, and to involve all stakeholders, including users and administrative and political structures in the countries concerned.

48. The representative of Algeria expressed, on one hand, his surprise regarding singling out the Tipasa case as an illustration of the counter-performance of sustainable development and of poor management of the cultural heritage, and, on the other hand, emphasized the failure to give due regard to the specific realities of Tipasa and of the plans to protect the cultural heritage. He requested that the explicit reference to Tipasa be withdrawn.

49. It was decided that a programme on the Cultural Heritage of the Mediterranean would be undertaken by MAP; this programme would be based on the 100 Historic Sites network but substantially recast in the context of sustainable development; and that linkages would be established with tourism development problems. It was decided that France and Tunisia would co-chair a working group. Monaco, Turkey, Morocco, Croatia and Greece agreed to participate in the group, which would remain open-ended; the Municipality of Naples and the MEDCITES network would be invited to participate; at the invitation of the representative of France an initial meeting would be organized by France within one year.

**Agenda item 9: New issues and reexamination of some already studied**

***Reexamination of issues already studied***

*Management of water demand*

50. Mr. Benoit recalled that the MCSD had adopted a set of recommendations on water in 1997 which emphasized the need to promote water demand management in the Mediterranean region. The great problem which arose with water in the region consisted of the limited resources and the large rise in demand. Previously, policy-makers had concentrated on increasing the supply of water, but now it had become necessary to concentrate on demand management, despite the emergence of new water resources through such techniques as desalination. He added that the initiative taken by the Mediterranean in this respect had been fully reported to the World Water Forum held in The Hague, where it had been clear that the action taken in the Mediterranean was among the most advanced in the world. The Contracting Parties had requested an assessment of the measures taken in response to the recommendations of the MCSD and the present initiative would be carried out in synergy and with the support of the Global Water Partnership (GWP). A steering committee had been established and a forum would be held in Rome in the autumn of 2002 on water demand management and its contribution to sustainable development in the Mediterranean. The work of the forum would be based on a series of case studies analysing the practical measures taken and their success or failure. The forum would also investigate the global strategies adopted by countries and donors, and would examine the feasibility of transversal tools for promoting water demand management, such as water charges. He recalled that there were already cases in which the reduction of water demand had led to major changes and savings in water supply plans, such as the decision not to build a dam which had previously been planned in Morocco.

51. In a brief discussion, several speakers emphasized the need to give priority to integrated water management, with particular reference to managing the demand for water. It was encouraging that the work carried out in the Mediterranean on this issue was providing guidance at the global level. Several speakers, in line with the recommendation to assess the effect given to MCSD recommendations every four years, called for an assessment of the action taken on this subject, on which the MCSD's work had been very effective. It was also recalled that account needed to be taken of the social and economic impact of water management and that it was important to develop models for the use of water in the various sectors, for example with a view to optimizing the selection of agricultural crops taking into account their water requirements.

52. In conclusion, the MCSD recalled the importance of what was at stake in this respect for the region, the proposals emerging from its deliberations in 1997, and the activities carried out since then by MAP, by the major international partners (the Euro-Mediterranean Conference in Turin, the World Forum in the Hague), as well as by certain countries. The MCSD emphasized the importance of the regional forum which would take place in Rome at the beginning of October 2002 and which was being organized by MAP-BP/RAC in partnership with the Global Water Partnership and with the support of France and Italy. It was agreed that the forum to be held in Rome should be organized under the aegis of the MCSD. It would provide an opportunity to assess in detail the progress made and the difficulties encountered, as well as the tools to be preferred for the implementation of the recommendations.

*Free trade and environment*

53. Mr. Benoit reviewed a number of the activities carried out by the Blue Plan in this area and the partnerships created in accordance with the MCSD recommendations adopted by the Contracting Parties. In particular, a partnership had been developed with the International Centre for Advanced Mediterranean Agronomic Studies (ICAMAS), a Mediterranean organization which brought together around a dozen Ministries of Agriculture and which had a secretariat and regional activity centres. Three case studies were being undertaken and a workshop would be organized next June with the ICAMAS in Montpellier to discuss the possible impacts of free trade on agriculture and fragile rural areas and possible responses. An activity had been launched in Morocco, in collaboration with METAP, on the possible impact on small and medium-sized enterprises in the textile sector in close collaboration with economic ministries, universities, enterprises and consumers. A subregional workshop could be organized on this subject in 2003 and the MCSD's thematic group on free trade and the environment could meet on the occasion of both the above workshops.

54. In the discussion of this subject, many speakers referred to the problems that would arise as a result of the growth in transport in the coming years. In view of the saturation levels that had been or would rapidly be reached in both air and road transport, maritime transport offered one of the few viable alternatives with the potential for major expansion. However, any increase in maritime transport would lead to greater risks to the environment in the Mediterranean. One of the major problems in this area was the need to control and prohibit the practice of dumping ballast water at sea. This practice introduced pollutants into the sea and, when ships had come from different regions, posed a threat through the introduction of alien species into the Mediterranean. It was noted that action was being taken in several countries concerning ballast water. In view of the problems in this respect concerning ships travelling between the Black Sea and the Mediterranean, Turkey was currently planning a ballast water management plan. A study on the impact of ballast water on marine pollution was being undertaken as part of a subregional programme covering Algeria, Morocco and Tunisia, financed by GEF. Discussions were also under way within IMO on the development of a convention to prohibit the dumping of ballast water at sea. It was to be hoped that a Mediterranean country would be selected by IMO in future for the related pilot activities.

55. It was noted that the growth of transport was a major factor to be taken into account with regard to the impact of free trade and that a prospective analysis should be undertaken on this subject, perhaps leading up to an expert meeting. Moreover, REMPEC and SPA/RAC were also concerned by this important issue and its impacts in their respective areas of concern. It was recalled in this respect that the Contracting Parties had recommended that a five-year programme should be undertaken on the impact of alien species in ballast water with a view to developing responses to protect the Mediterranean more effectively.

56. It was also emphasized that the Euro-Mediterranean free trade area was due to be established in 2010. Nevertheless, there was a very low level of popular awareness of the possible impact that free trade would have on society and the environment. Much more work needed to be undertaken on assessing the sustainability of free trade and on developing the relevant methodology. MAP and the MCSD needed to continue to play an active role in this respect, where possible in cooperation with relevant partners, such as Friends of the Earth and WWF. Although certain countries had undertaken some work on this subject, each country would have to take its own responsibilities and would need to look into the related questions in much greater detail, and particularly the impact of the free trade process at the sectoral level and on fragile areas.

57. Finally, it was recalled that the European Commission was about to call for tenders for a sustainability impact assessment of free trade in the region. The MCSD emphasized the value of this initiative. It was nevertheless noted that this work was of a strategic nature and would require political supervision. It was recalled in this respect that when the single market had been introduced in Europe, the task of assessment had been entrusted to a task force, and that in North America the evaluation of impacts had been carried out by an official body created in parallel with NAFTA, namely the Commission for Environmental Cooperation, which brought together the Ministries of the Environment of the three countries and had mobilized high-level decision-makers and experts for this task. It was therefore of great importance that such a study by the EC should not be entrusted to an academic institution or a commercial bureau. The MCSD hoped that MAP, which had the capacity to contribute to the assessment, and through the participatory approach of the MCSD, could be fully associated with it. It was agreed that the forthcoming meeting of the Bureau should discuss this matter, establish the relevant contacts with the European Commission and decide on the steps that MAP could take in this respect.

#### *Local Governance*

58. Mr Trumbic, Director of PAP/RAC, introducing the report on local governance contained in section VI of document UNEP(DEC)/MED WG.188/3, said that the issue of local management should be treated predominantly as follow-up because a number of its themes had been dealt with by the MCSD in recent years, in particular by the working groups on coastal zone management and urban development. A large number of the region's environmental problems were highly localized, and therefore solvable by local authorities, but in many of the countries administration was very centralized and despite initiatives in a number of sectors to give more power to lower levels of government, obstacles remained. The recommendations would enhance the use of local stakeholders in implementation and broaden their representation. The proposed Working Group should identify the main problems concerning sustainability at local level, set the rationale for action, establish priorities, decide who were the main stakeholders, form partner coalition and consensus building in specific policy areas, operationalize manageable tasks and implement, assess and establish benchmarks. An additional instrument would be the use of regional thematic forums to expand the range of actors.

59. Several speakers expressed support for the proposal, although some added that choices would have to be made between the various issues proposed since the MCSD had established a consensus not to deal with too many subjects at the same time. Others insisted that it was not a new issue but an institutional matter of how MCSD objectives were being implemented at local level. A local authority representative said that a working group would be vital in establishing how local authorities were implementing their mandates with or sometimes without the support of national governments. One speaker felt that the process might be lengthy and could not be limited to two or three years. Another proposed that the Secretariat request the MEDCITES network to play a leading role in work on the subject.

60. The Director of PAP/RAC said that it was a cross-cutting issue which integrated a number of themes and sought to improve their rate of implementation, considering that most of the issues were crucial and of permanent importance. As local governments would be dealt with in the context of the implementation and follow-up of recommendations related to coastal zone management and urban development, it was agreed that, with the support of PAP/RAC, the working group should focus on a few identifiable outputs, with a view to the holding of a forum in 2003 bringing together a wide range of actors.

### ***New issues***

61. Mr Hoballah indicated that the issues of agricultural and rural development, consumption patterns and urban waste management and financing and cooperation for sustainable development were all new issues. It would be necessary to select one of them, bearing in mind that the others would be dealt with in greater depth at a later date.

#### *Agriculture and rural development*

62. Mr Benoit, introducing the results of the feasibility study on agriculture and rural development in the Mediterranean region contained in section II of document UNEP(DEC)/MED WG.188/3, highlighted four main challenges that had been identified: reinforcing action to combat desertification in rural policies; reconciling agriculture and the environment more effectively; strengthening the sustainability of social bonds in rural communities, notably through economic diversification, and reducing regional inequalities; and placing sustainability high on the agenda of future international and regional agriculture negotiations. The working method envisaged consisted of dealing with the theme in two phases: the success and failure factors of sustainable rural development would be highlighted from case studies, then a shared vision would be agreed on concerning the principles for sustainability in this field, based on the lessons drawn from the first phase. In partnership with ICAMAS, MAP would set up a technical committee which would include three qualified experts representing the North, South and East of the Mediterranean.

63. Throughout the discussion, the importance of the topic was stressed as it provided an opportunity for a common vision for the Mediterranean, encompassing as it did the entire spectrum of problems to be tackled in the context of sustainable development, for which there were few guidelines to date. At the same time, differentiated approaches to the different problems faced were needed. Agriculture and rural development were particularly critical for the future of the Mediterranean basin, and the merit of the territorial approach was that it brought out the links with social and economic as well as environmental factors, such as biodiversity and desertification. The topic was an especially important one for the developing countries, because they were lagging behind, especially in infrastructure, and needed more sustainable and integrated policy approaches. Attention was drawn to the linkage with free trade, notably in the perspective of the establishment of a Mediterranean free trade area, although it was argued that it would be wrong to look at agriculture and rural development only in free trade terms, which would be too restrictive and in any event might lead to duplication. A fragmentary approach was to be avoided. It was also recalled that biotechnology was as important as biodiversity in view of its use as a tool to improve the quality of agriculture.

64. On agriculture and rural development, the meeting agreed that the MCSD could produce added value by working in partnership with other actors, notably ICAMAS, FAO and IAMF, as well as with national expertise. BP/RAC was given a mandate to do the preparatory work establishing the necessary contacts and partnerships. It was agreed that the issue would then be taken up in depth and the network would be operational in some 18 months' time.

#### *Consumption patterns and urban waste management*

65. Mr Benoit introduced the findings of a feasibility study on consumption patterns and urban waste management contained in section III of document UNEP(DEC)/WG.188/3. In view of the increasing volumes and costs, structural weaknesses and the lack of capacities in countries and towns in the south and the east of the region, combined with the increasing importance of powerful private international operators, public/private partnership approaches, sustainable financing instruments for the management of waste and support to



public authorities appeared to be the principal areas for reflection. By facilitating the exchange of experience and discussion, the MCSD could probably formulate useful proposals in this field.

66. On consumption patterns and urban waste management, the consensus of the meeting was that there was no need to embark on a full-scale programme immediately, but that work should be focused on building on the extensive knowledge that existed, particularly in the field of waste management, reviewing achievements to date and assessing what needed to be done in the future. The added value that the MCSD could bring to the issue would lie in networking and exchanging experience, and also in reinforcing capacities, since local authorities all too often lacked the necessary technical and financial resources.

67. The point was made that more work could be done on consumption patterns and linkages to promote re-use and re-cycling, and also on production systems upstream from consumption. Reference to the experience of the Nordic countries might be useful in that respect. On packaging, reference was made to the "polluter pays" principle and to the efforts to be made not only to encourage producers to use different packaging materials but also to build consumer awareness. One suggestion for raising funds at the local level was to levy a tax on waste management, as was already done for waste water in some countries. Practical lessons could be learned from pilot projects on waste management. While the problem of waste management was considered to be primarily one of financing, expertise and integrated management capacity at the country level, another difficulty mentioned was that of finding appropriate sites. Due consideration should also be given to the related MED POL activities, particularly in the context of the SAP, in relation to the hotspots programme, as well as to the METAP-SMAP project.

68. It was agreed that PAP/RAC would undertake efforts to identify partners. This would be done taking into account relevant activities and programmes carried on by existing organizations, such as METAP. Progress in this respect would be reported to the Eighth Meeting of the MCSD prior to defining a clearer orientation for the added value and expected achievements in this important area.

#### *Financing and cooperation for sustainable development*

69. Introducing the results of the feasibility study on capital markets and cooperation for sustainable development contained in Section IV of document UNEP(DEC)/WG.188/3, Mr Benoit highlighted the cost of the deteriorating environmental situation in the southern and eastern Mediterranean countries and Balkan countries, the question of matching funds and sustainability and the difficulties the countries faced in mobilizing financial resources for sustainable development. The MCSD could provide a useful contribution to the debate by serving as a legitimate "forum" for bringing together experts from the various partners concerned for a joint reflection to focus attention on the major challenges of financing sustainable development and to put forward strategies and proposals for the entire Mediterranean region. It could also make proposals at the regional and national levels aimed at: increasing the ability of countries, particularly in the south, to raise and absorb financial resources; setting up mechanisms able to mainstream environmental and sustainability concerns in cooperation and investment activities; and ensuring that the flow of financial resources was adequate and appropriate. To ensure a successful outcome of these considerations, the MCSD could set up a working group composed of representatives of a limited number of beneficiary countries, the main European partner countries, international financing institutions, private investors and NGOs. The Blue Plan would provide secretariat services to the working group and would be assisted by a qualified international expert. The working group would be responsible for undertaking a regional study and two or three national studies, which would be undertaken directly by experts in volunteer countries. They could be launched before December 2002 and completed in time for the findings to be

submitted to the MCSD at its Eighth Meeting in the spring of 2003, when a forum would be organized on this issue together with the free trade and environment issues.

70. A consensus emerged at the meeting that, although all three issues were important, it was the value added by the MCSD that needed to be considered. In that light, the theme of financing and cooperation for sustainable development would be considered the priority and would be the focus of work to be undertaken in the coming two years in cooperation with various partners. It furthermore provided an opportunity for the MCSD to explore a new and crucially important area and for a clear message to be conveyed about the economic benefits of sustainable development. Although the sustainable development financing theme was connected with the free trade theme, the approaches were different. The proposal to establish a geographically representative working group whose members would be volunteers was endorsed. The list of members was left open and those interested were invited to notify BP/RAC, due account being taken of those who had volunteered at the meeting, namely Croatia, Morocco and Tunisia. It was felt that the activity should encompass the Euro-Mediterranean dimension in its entirety (European Union-Balkan and European Union-Southern and Eastern Mediterranean countries partnerships). Strong commitment would be expected of those participating, who should ideally work closely with the various concerned ministries in the respective countries.

71. The debt burden, the decline in official development assistance (ODA) and the high cost of environmental degradation were cited, among others, as major obstacles to the financing of sustainable development, particularly for the countries of the South. One of the key issues was to identify financial mechanisms specifically targeted at sustainability goals. Debt swap arrangements – of which there were a number of successful examples – offered promising new opportunities. Further prospects for such arrangements, as well as guidance on other financing mechanisms and on public and private investment in general, would certainly emerge from the forthcoming International Conference on Financing for Development (Monterrey) and from the WSSD, although some misgivings were expressed about the “deliverability” of the Monterrey recommendations.

72. On the question of fund mobilization and sources of funding, it was suggested that further work should be done on the mobilization of private capital, with national insurance schemes being cited as an example. One of the problems identified in connection with external financing was that all too often it was linked to commercial interests. External financing should be used to promote solutions adapted to the local context. The need for a “bottom-up” approach to developing national and regional investment standards was stressed. With reference to national financing, it was recalled that an underutilized funding source, even in the countries of the North, was taxation. Moreover, due consideration should be given to domestic and international financing and foreign direct investment, as well as to the debt swap issue and the mobilization of public and private capital within countries.

73. A substantial amount of preparatory work, including studies encompassing the whole region as well as individual countries, would need to be done before the next MCSD meeting, which would be immediately preceded by an expert meeting at which experts would provide further guidance on the priorities and major issues to be addressed. Several speakers referred to national expertise and plans which could serve as input for the preparatory work. One speaker referred to the possibility of calling on MCSD partners to lend expert staff. The need to react swiftly to events and changing trends on the international scene was also emphasized.

74. In conclusion, the MCSD decided that the issue of "Financing and cooperation for sustainable development in the Mediterranean" would be launched without delay. It would proceed on the basis of the report presented by Blue Plan, supplemented by a number of considerations put forward at the meeting, in particular the question of the mobilization of domestic resources as well as public and private capital within countries, and recourse to more appropriate international and bilateral mechanisms, such as debt swap arrangements for sustainable development projects, and the promotion of foreign direct investment. In order to carry out these activities, the Secretariat would seek expertise available at the regional level and in volunteer countries, and also in relevant financial organizations and among the main European and international donors from whom support was requested. A steering committee bringing together these partners would provide guidance for the studies and the preparation of the forum scheduled to be held before the Eighth Meeting of the MCSD.

75. Finally, the meeting confirmed its consensus that the three new issues would be dealt with at a different pace and at different levels, as follows: financing and cooperation as a full-scale new programme on which work would proceed immediately; consumption patterns and waste management through networking and partnerships for a better identification of added value and expected achievement; and agriculture and rural development by building on the work of existing institutions pending the launching of a full-scale programme.

**Agenda item 10: Major groups: Participation and contribution to MCSD activities**

76. Introducing the discussion, Mr Hoballah recalled that at its Sixth Meeting, the MCSD had urged the major groups, namely NGOs, local authorities and socio-economic actors, to participate more actively and effectively in the work of the MCSD and to establish networks with former members in order to exchange experience. A first step had been taken in this respect through the organization of a consultation meeting for the major groups prior to the present meeting. This consultation meeting would be followed by a forum to be held in Naples in May 2002, bringing together all major group members, previous, present and those which had been newly selected.

77. Mr Ibrahim, Coordinator of ENDA Maghreb, reported on the consultation meeting which had been held by the representatives of the major groups on 12 March in Antalya, prior to the meeting of the MCSD. The consultation meeting had been attended by some past, present and future MCSD members from the major groups. He also reported on the outcome of the meeting of Mediterranean NGOs held in Nice in January 2002 as part of their ongoing process of preparation for the WSSD. The Nice Declaration set out the main lines of concern of the NGOs involved in the Euro-Mediterranean partnership concerning sustainable development. The NGOs concerned expected to open the process up to other partners in the major groups with a view to better reflecting Mediterranean priorities in Johannesburg and giving greater importance to regional approaches within the framework of the WSSD.

78. He explained that, 10 years after Rio, the major groups continued to consider the MCSD to be a unique model of a regional commission bringing together governments and representatives of the major groups on an equal footing. Nevertheless, despite its contribution in translating some of the Agenda MED 21 items into concrete and effective policy measures and strategic recommendations, still more was expected of it. There was therefore a need to strengthen the role of the MCSD and to revitalize the political will of the Contracting Parties to translate its recommendations into action-oriented strategies.

79. The major groups believed that the MCSD could gain in efficiency by improving the process of identifying potential candidates from the respective major groups, starting from the list of MAP Partners, at least in the case of the NGOs. It would be important to define a set of criteria to be fulfilled by new candidates applying for membership of the MCSD. The selection process could also be improved through greater involvement of current members in the selection of new members, as well as by involving federations of city mayors and professional associations in the identification of potential candidates.

80. The meeting of the major groups made a number of specific proposals to improve their contribution to the MCSD. These included the establishment of a networking system within each major group, with the designation of a focal point for each major group on an annual basis to improve the coordination and flow of information within each group and with the other major groups, as well as with the Secretariat. Emphasis would also be placed on the need for all the members of the major groups to be active in the MCSD through participation in its meetings and the provision of inputs to the various working groups.

81. The representatives of the major groups had also called for briefing sessions to be organized by the Secretariat for new members to clarify the issues involved, the role of the members and their potential contribution to the MCSD. They considered that the staffing and budget of the Secretariat should be strengthened to improve communication with the major groups with a view to enhancing their involvement in the work of the MCSD. Finally, they called for an enhanced role and greater coordination between the regional activities centers; wider involvement of the relevant national institutions, beyond Ministries of the Environment, in the work of MCSD and in the follow-up to its recommendations; and the promotion of a sustainable development culture through the involvement of all the relevant national actors in discussions of the issues covered by the MCSD, particularly through a consultation to be held prior to its sessions. It would also be important to establish a communication strategy between the major groups and the Contracting Parties, which should be facilitated by the Secretariat.

82. In the discussion which followed this presentation, the value was emphasized of the contribution that the major groups had already made and could make in future to the work of the MCSD, particularly by providing a perspective which was different from that of the Contracting Parties and through their extensive links and networks with the many components of civil society. Many of the proposals made would enhance their role in the MCSD, and particularly the strengthening of the Secretariat so that it could improve links with the various partners in the respective major groups. However, care should be taken to ensure that the members from the major groups did not constitute a reserved club, but were truly representative of their various sectors, including the academic sector. It was further pointed out that the members of each major group represented somewhat different interests and could not always be expected to adopt a unified position on all issues. It was also noted that many of the members of the MCSD from the major groups, particularly NGOs, encountered financial problems in participating fully in the work of the MCSD and would need to seek further funding for this purpose, either from donors or through the Secretariat.

83. The meeting was informed that past, present and future MCSD members of the major groups would be invited to the workshop to be organized in Naples in the second half of May, with the support of the municipality of Naples and the Secretariat, to continue the process of reflection and coordination between the major groups. Although more advanced notice of this and other meetings would be useful to all concerned, it was not always possible to give such details well in advance. Finally, it was proposed that pilot activities in the field of sustainable development involving members of the major groups should be undertaken in the near future as another innovation through which the Mediterranean region could take a leadership role at the global level.

**Agenda item 11: MAP/MCSD participation and contribution to the WSSD preparatory process**

84. Introducing the discussion, Mr Hoballah recalled that the Contracting Parties had requested the MCSD to contribute to the preparatory process for the WSSD. In this respect, the strategic review and its synthesis report had been prepared and a series of short documents were nearing completion on the SAP, integrated coastal zone management, the MAP legal framework, cleaner production, biodiversity, maritime pollution prevention activities and the contribution of remote sensing to the compilation of information on sustainable development. The various documents would be brief and specially edited for the purpose. Where possible, each of these documents would be summarized in a two-page sheet that could be widely disseminated. MAP and the MCSD would also contribute to the preparation of the WSSD through a UNEP side event on regional seas at the PrepCom meeting to be held in Jakarta, which would feature prominently the activities undertaken in the Mediterranean region. Moreover, Mediterranean issues and the work of MAP and the MCSD would be presented at the WSSD through specific side events to be organized by NGOs. There remained the dimension of participation by the Contracting Parties and other partners, which should be encouraged to cover MAP and the MCSD in their individual presentations so as to give wider coverage to the progress made and achievements towards Sustainable Development in the Mediterranean.

85. In the discussion on this subject, it was emphasized that the WSSD was a major event focusing on how the commitments made at Rio had been implemented. It was therefore important to show what had been achieved in the Mediterranean, including everything that had been done by the MCSD to make sustainable development a reality. However, it was also necessary to mention the limitations encountered by environmental ministries in this respect and the need to involve all the other concerned partners if real progress were to be made. It was also emphasized that the documents prepared for the WSSD needed to be available in sufficient numbers and should be sufficiently brief so that they could be easily read by those concerned.

86. It was decided that the information on the MCSD's activities and MAP should be more widely disseminated throughout the WSSD process. It was also decided that the members of the MCSD should ensure their active participation in the WSSD to promote the visibility of the region and its active contribution to sustainable development.

**Agenda item 12: Eighth MCSD Meeting**

87. Mr Hoballah recalled that the Government of Algeria had proposed to host the Eighth Meeting of the MCSD and said that, due to the postponement of the Seventh Meeting, this would now be held around April 2003 in Algiers. The agenda proposed in document UNEP(DEC)/MED WG.188/2 would be refined to take into account the discussions at the present meeting. He also recalled that two meetings of the Steering Committee were planned before the Eighth Meeting. Finally, it was proposed to organize immediately prior to the MCSD meeting a two-day forum of experts on finance and cooperation for sustainable development.

88. The representative of Algeria thanked Turkey for the efficient organization of the present meeting and hoped that his country would be equally successful in organizing the Eighth Meeting of the MCSD. He hoped that his country would be able to welcome all of the members of the MCSD to the meeting in Algiers.

89. The MCSD thanked the Government of Turkey for all of its endeavours in organizing the present meeting. It also thanked the Government of Algeria for its kind offer to host the Eighth MCSD and that full support would be provided to it to ensure the success of the meeting.
90. It was finally agreed that the next MCSD meeting would be held in Algeria, preceded by a two-days forum of "Financing and Cooperation".

**Agenda item 13: Adoption of the report**

91. The report, as amended to take into account the comments of the members of the MCSD, was adopted.

92. Following the discussions concerning the adoption of the report, the MCSD decided that the product of its meetings would henceforth consist principally of a reasoned record of decisions preceded by a short introduction reflecting only the spirit of the discussions, the whole of which would not be longer than ten pages. The lessons to be learned from this new type of report would be drawn at the next session of the MCSD.

**Agenda item 14: Closure of the meeting**

93. Following the usual exchange of courtesies, the meeting was declared closed at 1 pm on Saturday 16 March 2002.

**ANNEX I****LIST OF PARTICIPANTS -LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS  
MCSD MEMBERS-MEMBRE DE LA CMDD****ALBANIA-ALBANIE**

**Mr Sajmir Hoxha**  
Minister's Advisor  
Ministry of Environment  
Rruga Durrës, Nr 27  
Tirana, Albania  
Tel : 3554270623  
Fax: 3554270627  
E-mail: s-hoxha@yahoo.com

**ALGERIA - ALGERIE**

**M. Djamel Echirk**  
Inspecteur Général de l'Environnement  
Direction générale de l'environnement  
Ministère de l'Aménagement du Territoire, et de  
l'environnement  
Palais Mostapha Pacha, blvd de l'indépendance  
16000 Alger, Algérie

Immeuble les 4 canons –les Tagarins  
Alger, Algérie

Tel: 213 21432801/04- 676360  
Fax: 213 21 676693  
Email: d.echirk@environnement-dz.org  
Email: sdai@environnement-dz.org

**ASSOCIATION INTERNATIONALE FORÊTS  
MÉDITERRANÉENNES (AIFM)**

**Mr. Mohamed Labri Chacroun**  
Président  
Association Internationale Forêts Méditerranéennes  
14, rue Louis Astouin  
13002 Marseille  
France  
Tel: 33 4 91907170  
Fax: 33 4 91907162  
Email: info@aifm.org

**BOSNIA & HERZEGOVINA  
BOSNIE-HERZEGOVINE**

**Mr Tarik Kupusovic**  
Ministry of Physical Planning and Environment  
Hydro Engineering Institute  
Box 405  
S. Tumica A1  
71000 Sarajevo  
Bosnia and Herzegovina  
Tel/Fax: 387 33 207949  
Email: mapbh@bih.net, mapbacutic@net.ba

**CALVIA MUNICIPALITY-  
MUNICIPALITE DE CALVIE**

**Ms Carolina Soau Boch**  
Local Agenda 21 Coordinator  
E-mail: csuau@calvia.com

**Ms. Antonya Moya**  
European Projects Coordinator  
E-mail: amoya@calvia.com

Calvia City Council  
Can Vich 29, Calvia  
Mallorca07184  
Spain  
Tel: 34971139100  
Fax: 34971139161

**CHAMBERS GROUP FOR THE DEVELOPMENT  
OF GREEK ISLANDS (EOAEN)**

**M. Georges Giourgas**  
Conseiller Affaires Européennes  
Chambers Group for the Development of Greek  
Islands (EOAEN)  
17, Avenue de Phalenes  
Bruxelles 1000 Belgique  
Tel: 322 6485726  
Fax: 322 6485725  
Email: g.giourgas@freebel.net

**CROATIA - CROATIE**

**Ms Magrita Mastrovic**  
Head of Unit  
Marine and Coastal Protection Unit  
Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning  
Uzarska ulica 2/I  
51000 Rijeka  
Croatia  
Tel: 385 51 213499  
Fax: 385 51 214324  
Email: andrija.randic@duzo.hinet.hr

**EGYPT - EGYPTE**

**Mr. Yasser Hassan**  
Second Secretary of the Embassy of Egypt in Ankara  
Ataturk bulvari 126, kavaklidere  
Ankara  
Turkey  
Tel: 90312 4261026  
Fax : 90312 4270099  
E-mail: toyasser@hotmail.com

**ENVIRONNEMENT ET DÉVELOPPEMENT  
AU MAGHREB (ENDA)**

**Mr Magdi Ibrahim**

Coordinator  
ENDA Maghreb  
196, Quartier OLM  
Rabat Souissi  
Maroc  
Tel: 212 37 756414 or 15  
Fax: 212 37 756413  
Email: endamaghreb@enda.org.ma  
Email: Magdi@enda.org.ma

**FRANCE - FRANCE**

**M. Serge Antoine**

Délégué de la France à la CMDD  
Comité 21, 3 villa d'Orléans  
75014 Paris, France  
Tel : 33 1 43278421  
Fax : 33 1 43278420  
Email: antoine@comite21.asso.fr  
et  
10, rue de la Fontaine  
91570 Bièvres, France  
Tel : 33 1 69412056  
Fax : 33 1 69855233

**Mr Jean-Raphael Chaponniere**

Conseiller Économique Régional (Méditerranée)  
Services d'Expansion Economique  
Consulat General de France à Istanbul  
Odakule etage 10-Istiklal cad.284/288  
B.P. 46 – 80072 Beyoglu/Istanbul  
Turkey  
Tel: 902122930427  
Fax: 902122492658  
E-mail: jean-raphael.chaponniere@dree.org

**GREECE - GRECE**

**Mr Alexander LASCARATOS**

MAP Focal Point  
Department of Applied Physics University of Athens  
(buildings-PHYS-V)  
Panepistimioupolis  
15784 Athens  
Tel: 301072766839 – 7276933  
Fax: 30107295281  
E-mail: alasc@oc.phys.uoa.gr

**INSTITUT MÉDITERRANÉEN DE L'EAU**

**Ms Selmine Burak**

Tepecik Yolu, Incesu Sok  
Erdem Apt N.76/8  
Etiler 80630 Istanbul  
Turkey  
Tel/Fax : 90213515207  
E-mail : sburak@istanbul.edu.tr

**IME**

Les Docks - Atrium 10.3  
10, place de la Joliette  
13002 Marseille, France  
Tel: 334 91598777  
Fax: 334 91598778  
Email: info@ime-eau.org

**ISRAEL-ISRAEL**

**Ms Valerie Brachya**

Deputy Director General  
Ministry of the Environment  
P.O. Box 34033  
5 Kanfei Nesharim Str  
95464 Jerusalem  
Israel  
Tel: 97226553850/1  
Fax: 97226553853  
E-mail: valerie@sviva.gov.il

**ITALY - ITALIE**

**Mr Aldo Iacomelli**

Ministry of Environment  
Via C. Colombo 44  
Rome 00147, Italy  
Tel: 390657228165  
Fax: 390657228168  
E-mail: iacomelli.aldo@minambiente.it

**MS. Stefania Fusani**

External Relations  
Agenzia Nazionale per la Protezione dell'Ambiente (ANPA)  
Via Vitaliano Brancati, 48, 00144 Roma, Italy  
Tel: 390650072862 - 393473362003-  
Fax: 390650072834  
E-mail: fusani@anpa.it



**LIBYA - LIBIE****Mr. Mohamed Amer**

Acting Head of Environmental General Authority

**Mr. Marwan Ibrahim Tahoni**

NGO Department

Environmental General Authority  
El Gheran, P.O. Box 83618, Tripoli  
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya  
Tel: 218 21 4840045-4840043  
Fax: 218 21 4839991, 218 21 3338098, 4839992  
E-mail: ega@egalibya.org

**MALTA - MALTE****Mr Paul Mifsud**

Permanent Secretary  
Ministry for Resources and Infrastructure  
Floriana CMR02, Malta  
Tel: 356 21 241644  
Fax: 356 21 250335  
Email: paul.mifsud@magnet.mt

**MEDCOAST****Mr Erdal Ozhan**

Professor and Chairman  
Middle East Technical University  
Ankara 06531  
Turkey  
Tel: 90 312 2105429/30/35  
Fax: 90 312 2101412  
E-mail: medcoast@metu.edu.tr, ozhan@medu.edu.tr

**MEDITERRANEAN ASSOCIATION OF THE  
NATIONAL AGENCIES FOR ENERGY  
CONSERVATION  
ASSOCIATION MEDITERRANEENNE DES  
AGENCES NATIONALES DE MAITRISE  
DE L'ENERGIE (MEDENER)**

**Mr Abdelhanine Benhalou**

President  
c/o CDER  
Avenue Machaar Al Haram, Issil  
Marrakech 40000  
Morocco  
Tel: 212 44 309809-22, 263061899  
Fax: 212 44 309795  
E-mail: dgcdcr@iam.net.ma

**MED FORUM- RÉSEAU D'ONG DE LA MEDITERRANÉE  
ENVIRONNEMENT ET DÉVELOPPEMENT**

**Mr Mohamed Zeidan**

MEDFORUM Executive Committee

FEDA (Friends of Environment and Development  
Association)  
3 Irak Street  
El Mohandeseen, Giza  
Cairo, Egypt  
Tel.: 20122136409, 00202 795 53346  
Fax: 202 795 7637, 3350081  
E-mail: feda@idsc.net.eg

Med Forum  
Gran Via de les Corts Catalanes, 643, 3  
08010 Barcelona  
Espagne  
Tel: 3493 4124309  
Fax: 3493 4124622  
Email: medforum@pangea.org

**MONACO - MONACO****S.E. M. Bernard Fautrier**

Ministre Plénipotentiaire  
Chargé de la coopération internationale pour  
l'environnement et le développement  
Tel: 377 93158333  
Fax: 377 93158888/ 93509591  
Email: bfautrier@gouv.mc

**M. Patrick Van Klaveren**

Conseiller Technique  
Direction des Relations Exterieures  
Le Conseille Technique du Ministre Plénipotentiaire  
Chargé de la coopération internationale pour  
l'environnement et le développement

16 Villa Girasole, Bd. de Suisse  
MC-98000 Monaco-Ville  
Monaco  
Tel: 377-93158148, 377-680861895  
Fax: 377-93509591  
E-mail: pvanklaveren@gouv.mc

**Ms. Tuna Askoy Koprulu**

General Council of Monaco in Istanbul  
Koubasi Arkasi sok.4/2  
Yenikoy, Istanbul  
Turkey  
Tel : 902122624148  
Fax: 902122863036

**MOROCCO - MAROC****M. Abdelfetah Sahibi**

Chef de Division Planification et Prospective  
Ministère de l'Aménagement du Territoire,  
de l'Urbanisme de l'Habitat et de l'Environnement  
36, avenue Al Abtal, Agdal  
Rabat, Maroc  
Tel: 212 37 681018  
Fax: 212 37 68 0741  
Email: dpp@minenv.gov.ma

**M. Mourad Amil**

Chef de division de l'observatoire national de  
l'environnement  
Ministère de l'Aménagement du Territoire,  
de l'Environnement, de l'Urbanisme  
de l'Habitat et de l'Environnement  
36, avenue Al Abtal, Agdal  
Rabat , Maroc  
Tel: 212 37 681001  
Fax: 212 37 772756  
Email: onem@minenv.gov.ma

**SLOVENIA - SLOVENIE**

**Mr Mitja Bricelj**

Adviser to the Government  
Ministry for Environment and Spatial Planning  
Vojkova 1b  
SI-61000 Ljubljana  
Slovenia  
Tel: 386 1 478 84421/2, 1 4787380  
Fax: 386 1 478 7420  
Email:mitja.bricelj@gov.si

**SPAIN - ESPAGNE**

**Mr Victor Escobar**

Head of Service  
Sub-directorate of Legislative Affairs and  
Institutional Coordination  
Tel: 34-91-5976356  
Fax: 34-91-5975980  
E-mail: victor.escobar@sgnci.mma.es

**Mr Adrian Vecino Varela**

Subdireccion General de Cooperacion Institucional  
Y Politicas Sectoriales  
  
Ministerio de Medio Ambiente  
Plaza San Juan de la Cruz s/n  
General Directorate of Quality and Env. Assess.  
Madrid 28071s  
Spain  
Tel: 34-91-5976732  
Fax: 34-91-5975980  
E-mail:adrian.vecino@sgcips.mma.es

**SYRIA - SYRIE**

**Mr Thaer Aldeif**

Director of Environment, Directorate of Environment  
in Deir Ezzor City  
Ministry of Environment  
P.O. Box 3773  
Tolyani Street, Damascus  
*or*  
*P.O.Box 523, Deir Ezzor*  
Syrian Arab Republic  
Tel: 963 51 223679,226167,3336027, 3310381  
Fax: 963 51 223679 , 3335645, 4412577  
Email: env-min@net.sy, env-zor@mail.sy

**Ms Amira Qarawani**

Third Secretary  
Syrian Embassy in Ankara  
Tel: 903124409657  
Fax: 903124409658  
Email: amiraq69@hotmail.com

**TUNISIA - TUNISIE**

**M. Khalil Attia**

Directeur Général  
Agence Nationale de Protection  
de l'Environnement (ANPE)  
12 rue du Cameroun-Belvédère  
Tunis, Tunisie

Tel: 216 1 840221

Fax: 216 1 848069

Email: anpe.dg@anpe.nat.tn, boc.meat@rdd.tn

**TURKEY - TURQUIE**

**H. E.Mr Fevzi Aytekin**

Minister of Environment

**Ms Nelka Inanç**

Deputy Undersecretary

**Ms Kumru Adanali**

Head, Foreign Relations Department  
Email: kumrua@hotmail.com

**Ms. Ebru Coskun**

Biologist  
Email: ebrucos@yahoo.com

**Mr Ufuk Küçükay**

Expert  
Tel: 90312 2879963/4212  
E-mail: ukucukay@hotmail.com  
Ministry of Environment  
Eskisehir Yolu 8 KM, Bilkent  
06100 Ankara, Turkey  
Tel: 90 312 2851705- 2853197  
Fax: 90 312 2853739

**Mr Ahmet Ergen**

Deputy Director  
County Directorate of Environment  
Kilitoprak Mah Aspndoj bulv. No.177 AN – T  
Tel: 90 242 3218006  
Fax: 90 242 323310

**World Wild Fund**

**Mediterranean Programme**

**Mr. Paolo Lombardi**

Director  
Via PO 25/C, Rome 00135  
Italy  
Tel: 3906 84497381  
Fax: 3906 8413866  
E-mail: plombardi@wwfmedpo.org

**UNITED NATIONS BODIES AND SECRETARIATS  
SECRETARIAT DES NATIONS UNIES  
OTHER OBSERVERS  
AUTRES OBSERVATEURS**

**IUCN - Centre for Mediterranean Cooperation  
(International Union for the Conservation of Nature)**

**Mr Jamie Skinner**

Director  
Mediterranean Programme  
PT 74, Parque Tecnológico de Andalucía  
Calle Maria Curie, 35  
29590 Campanillas, Malaga  
Spain  
Tel : 34 952028430  
Fax: 34 952619366-5  
E-mail: Jamie.skinner@iucn.org

**FOE/MEDNET (FRIENDS OF THE  
EARTH/MEDITERRANEAN NETWORK)**

**Ms Hanan Awwad**

Trade and Environment Project Manager  
Friends of the Earth Middle East  
P.O.Box 55302, E. Jerusalem 97400  
Tel: 97054321802  
E-mail: mednet@foeeurope.org  
Email: mftz@hotmail.com

Friends of the Earth International  
29, rue Blanche  
B-1060 Bruxelles  
Belgique  
Tel: 322 5420180  
Fax: 322 5375596  
Email: mednet@foeeurope.org

**RAED-ARAB NETWORK FOR ENVIRONMENT AND  
DEVELOPMENT**

**Mr Emad Adly**

General Coordinator  
Arab Network for Environment and Development (RAED)  
Zahra'a el Maadi Street, Masr Lel Ta'ameer Building No.3  
First floor, entrance 1-2,  
Zahra'a el Maadi, Cairo, Egypt  
Tel: 202 5161519-5161245  
Fax: 202 5162961  
Email: aoye@link.net

**ICC/ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CHAMBERS  
OF MONACO**

**Ms Dany Rubrecht**

Informaiton/Communication  
11 rue du Gabian, P.O.Box 653  
Le Concorde  
Monaco 98013, Monaco  
Tel : 37797986868  
Fax: 37797986869  
E-mail: drubrecht@cde.mc

**MEDITERRANEAN UNIVERSITY OF ANTALYA**

**Mr Tuncay Neyisci**

**Turkey Akdeniz University**  
Tel/Fax: 90 242 2275360  
E-mail: tneyisci@hotmail.com

**Mr Abdullah Tekin**

**Ms Gürsel Oztunali Kayic**

Maitrresse de conference  
Centre de recherche des problemes environnementaux  
Tel : 902422278544-2284698  
Email: gulser@iibf.akdeniz.edu.tr

Akdeniz universitesi I.I.B.F Kampus  
Antalya  
Turkey

**PALESTINIAN AUTHORITY-  
AUTORITE PALESTINIEN**

**Mr. Said Jalala**

Director General  
Ministry of Environment  
El Thawra Street  
Gaza  
Tel: 970 8 2847208  
Fax: 970 8 2847198  
E-mail: said\_jalala@hotmail.com

**REGIONAL ACTIVITY CENTRES OF THE MEDITERRANEAN ACTION PLAN  
CENTRES D'ACTIVITES REGIONALES DU PLAN D'ACTION POUR LA MEDITERRANEE**

**REGIONAL ACTIVITY CENTRE FOR THE BLUE PLAN  
(RAC/BP)  
CENTRE D'ACTIVITES REGIONALES DU PLAN BLUE  
(CAR/PB)**

**M. Guillaume Benoit**

Directeur  
Plan Bleu, Centre d'Activité Regional  
(PB/CAR)  
15 rue Ludwig van Beethoven  
Sophia Antipolis  
F-06560 Valbonne  
France  
Tel: 33492387130/33  
Fax: 33492387131  
E-mail: planbleu@planbleu.org, gbenoit@planbleu.org

**REGIONAL ACTIVITY CENTRE FOR THE PRIORITY  
ACTIONS PROGRAMME (RAC/PAP)  
CENTRE D'ACTIVITES REGIONALES DU PROGRAMME  
D'ACTIONS PRIORITAIRES)**

**Mr Ivica Trumbic**

Director  
PAP/RAC  
11 Kraj Sv. Ivana  
P.O Box 74  
HR-21000 Split, Croatia  
Tel: 38521343499  
Fax: 38521361677  
E-mail: pap@gradst.hr  
E-mail: ivica.trumbic@ppa.tel.hr

**REGIONAL ACTIVITY CENTRE FOR SPECIALLY  
PROTECTED AREAS (SPA/RAC)  
CENTRE D'ACTIVITES REGIONALES POUR LES AIRES  
SPECIALEMENT PROTÉGÉS (CAR/ASP)**

**Mr Mohamed Adel Hentati**

Director  
SPA/RAC  
Boulevard de l'environnement  
B.P. 337, 1080 Tunis Cedex  
Tunisie  
Tel: 21671795760  
Fax: 21671797349  
E-mail: car-asp@rac-spa.org.tn

**REGIONAL ACTIVITY CENTRE FOR ENVIRONMENT  
REMOTE SENSING CENTRE (ERS/RAC)  
CENTRE D'ACTIVITIES REGIONALES  
POUR LA TELEDETECTION EN MATIERE  
D'ENVIRONNEMENT (CAR/TDE)**

**Mr Giovanni Cannizzaro**

Director  
Regional Activity Centre for Remote Sensing  
2, Via Giusti  
90144 Palermo  
Italy  
Tel: 39091342368  
Fax: 39091308512  
E-mail: ctm@tin.it

**MAP SECRETARIAT FOR 100 MEDITERRANEAN  
HISTORIC SITES  
SECRETARIAT DU PAM DE 100 SITES HISTORIQUES**

**M. Daniel Drocourt**

Coordonnateur  
"100 Sites historiques méditerranéens"  
du Plan d'action pour la Méditerranée  
Atelier du Patrimoine de la Ville de Marseille  
10 Ter Square Belsunce  
F-13001 Marseille  
France  
Tel: 33491907874  
Fax: 33491561461  
E-mail: ddrocourt@mairie-marseille.fr

**COORDINATING UNIT FOR THE MEDITERRANEAN ACTION PLAN  
SECRETARIAT OF THE MCSD  
UNITE DE COORDINATION DU PLAN D'ACTION POUR LA MEDITERRANEE  
SECRETARIAT DE LA CMDD**

**Mr Lucien Chabason**

Coordinator  
Tel: 30107273101  
E-mail:chabason@unepmap.gr

**Mr Arab Hoballah**

Deputy Coordinator  
Tel: 30107273126  
E-mail:hoballah@unepmap.gr

**Mr Francesco Saverio Civili**

MED POL Coordinator  
Tel: 30107273106  
E-mail: fscivili@unepmap.gr

Coordinating Unit for the  
Mediterranean Action Plan  
48, Vassileos Konstantinou Avenue  
P. O. Box 18019  
116 10 Athens  
Greece  
Tel: 3010 7273100  
Fax: 3010 7253196-7  
Email : unepmedu@unepmap.gr  
www.unepmap.org

**ANNEX II**

**Seventh meeting of the MCSD, 13-16 March 2002, Antalya  
Provisional Agenda**

	<b>13 March</b>	<b>14 March</b>	<b>15 March</b>	<b>16 March</b>
<b>09.00-11.00</b>	S1. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opening of the meeting;</li> <li>Election of the Steering Committee;</li> <li>Adoption of the Agenda and organisation of the meeting;</li> <li>MCSD assessment and prospects (<i>presentation of the Secretariat/Expert report</i>)</li> </ul>	S5. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>"Framework Orientations" for Sustainable Development in the Mediterranean Region</li> </ul>	S9. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New issues and re-examination of some already studied. (<i>presentation by concerned Support Centres</i>)</li> </ul>	S13.  <i>Free Session</i>
<b>11.00-11.30</b>	<b>Coffee Break</b>			
<b>11.30-13.30</b>	S2. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MCSD Assessment and Prospects; Discussion</li> </ul>	S6. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>"Framework Orientations" discussion (cont.)</li> </ul>	S10. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New issues and re-examination of some already studied. (<i>presentation by concerned Support Centres</i>)</li> </ul>	S14. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review and adoption of the report</li> <li>Conclusions and closure of the meeting</li> </ul>
<b>13.30-15.00</b>	<b>Lunch Break</b>			
<b>15.00-16.30</b>	S3. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MCSD Assessment and Prospects, Discussion</li> </ul>	S7. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tourism and Sustainable Development: a regional programme (by Turkey)</li> </ul>	S11. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Major Groups: participation and contribution to MCSD activities (<i>presentation of conclusions of Major Groups Forum and discussion</i>)</li> </ul>	
<b>16.30-17.00</b>	<b>Coffee Break</b>			
<b>17.00-18.30</b>	S4. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assessment of implementation and follow up of MCSD recommendations and proposals for action</li> </ul>	S8. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Historic Sites and Sustainable Development</li> </ul>	S12. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MAP/MCSD participation and contribution to the WSSD preparatory process;</li> <li>Other matters 8<sup>th</sup> MCSD meeting (agenda, venue)</li> </ul>	

## **ANNEX III**

### **Record of decisions of the Seventh Meeting of the Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development (MCSD) Antalya, 13-16 March, 2002**

#### **Election of the Steering Committee**

The Commission elected its new Steering Committee, the composition of which was as follows: President: H.E. Mr F. Aytekin (Turkey), Vice-Presidents: H.E. Mr B. Fautrier (Monaco), Mr J. Echirk (Algeria), Mr V. Escobar (Spain), Ms M. Najera Aranzabal (Municipality of Calvia), Mr A. Benhallou (MEDENER), Rapporteur: Mr M. Ibrahim (ENDA)

#### **MCSD assessment and prospects**

After examining the report presented by the Secretariat, the Meeting agreed that a task force of the MCSD should be established to examine ways in which the MCSD could be strengthened and its action refocused in the post-Johannesburg era. The task force should take into account developments in other regions and prepare comprehensive proposals. (The terms of reference for the task force, prepared by Italy and Spain in collaboration with the Secretariat, are attached as Annex IV, Appendix II to the report of the Meeting.). Moreover, a revised version of the summary of conclusions and recommendations was agreed upon, incorporating the comments made during the discussion, and reworded in language more suitable to a text intended for wide distribution. (This revised version is attached as Annex IV, Appendix I to the report of the Meeting.)

#### **Assessment of implementation and follow-up of MCSD recommendations and proposals for action**

Considering that this issue was previously discussed at the Extraordinary meeting of the MCSD and examining related recommendations as adopted by the 12<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Contracting Parties, the Meeting agreed that regional thematic forums should be organized in the context of the MCSD for those responsible at the national level in the various fields covered by its recommendations, as well as other concerned actors. Such regional forums should then be followed up by further activities within countries to ensure that a large number of stakeholders were aware of the MCSD's guidance and recommendations and were involved in their implementation. It was agreed that this methodology should be first tested in the field of tourism, which was of immense importance in the region and where little had yet been done to follow-up the MCSD's recommendations.

#### **"Framework orientations" for a Mediterranean strategy for sustainable development**

The Meeting recalled that the terms of reference of the MCSD included the provision of assistance to the Contracting Parties in formulating and implementing a regional sustainable development strategy. It was recalled in this respect that, to be effective, in view of the breadth of the subject, such a strategy would need to focus on a small number of issues related, for example, to severe or irreversible threats, the well-being of the people and regional cooperation.

In this context, the Meeting agreed that the holding of an expert meeting in October in Spain to prepare the orientations based on the above three key pillars by applying the proposed methodology was a sound way to establish a coherent framework, a detailed table of contents and a related agenda for the formulation of a Mediterranean strategy for sustainable development, with a view to preparing a brief preliminary draft taking into account other relevant initiatives for submission to the Eighth Meeting of the MCSD.

### **Tourism and sustainable development: A regional programme**

In response to a proposal by Turkey to establish a MAP Regional Activity Centre/Eco-Tourism (RAC/ET) in Antalya, Turkey, subsequently modified to a programme on tourism and sustainable development, the Meeting agreed that Turkey would review its proposals for the development of a programme on tourism and sustainable development, giving due consideration to the comments made by the MCSD, with a view to presenting a more detailed proposal to the next meeting of the MCSD so that it could make its recommendations to the Contracting Parties for a final decision on this issue.

### **Historic sites and sustainable development**

The Meeting noted that, at their 12<sup>th</sup> Ordinary Meeting and following an evaluation of the 100 Historic Sites Programme, the Contracting Parties had requested the Secretariat to prepare, using the MCSD framework as appropriate, a draft of a new programme on cultural heritage. The Meeting decided that a programme on the Cultural Heritage of the Mediterranean would be undertaken by MAP; this programme would be based on the 100 Historic Sites network, but substantially recast in the context of sustainable development; and that linkages would be established with tourism development problems. It was decided that France and Tunisia would co-chair a working group. Monaco, Turkey, Morocco, Croatia and Greece agreed to participate in the group, which would remain open-ended; the Municipality of Naples and the MEDCITES network would be invited to participate; at the invitation of the representative of France, an initial meeting would be organized by France within one year.

### **New issues and reexamination of some already studied**

#### ***Reexamination of issues already studied***

##### ***Management of water demand***

The Meeting recalled the importance of what was at stake with regard to the management of water demand for the region, the proposals emerging from the MCSD's deliberations in 1997, and the activities carried out since then by MAP, by the major international partners (the Euro-Mediterranean Conference in Turin, the World Forum in the Hague), as well as by certain countries. The Meeting emphasized the importance of the regional forum which would take place in Rome at the beginning of October 2003 and which was being organized by MAP-BP/RAC in partnership with the Global Water Partnership and with the support of France and Italy. It would provide an opportunity to assess in detail the progress made and the difficulties encountered, as well as the tools to be preferred for the implementation of the recommendations. The forum would therefore also be under the aegis of the MCSD.



*Free trade and environment*

The Meeting reviewed progress on this issue and recalled that the European Commission was about to call for tenders for a sustainability impact assessment of free trade in the region. The Meeting hoped that MAP, which had the capacity to contribute to the assessment, and through the participatory approach of the MCSD, could be fully associated with it. It was agreed that the forthcoming meeting of the Bureau should discuss this matter, establish the relevant contacts with the European Commission and decide on the steps that MAP could take in this respect.

*Local governance*

Following a proposal that a working group on local governance should be set up to identify the main problems concerning sustainability at local level, set the rationale for action, establish priorities, decide who were the main stakeholders, form partner coalitions and consensus building in specific policy areas, operationalize manageable tasks and implement, assess and establish benchmarks, the Meeting agreed that, with the support of PAP/RAC, the working group should focus on a few identifiable outputs, with a view to the holding of a forum in 2003 bringing together a wide range of actors.

***New issues****Agriculture and rural development*

Considering the importance of agriculture and rural development for the Mediterranean Sustainable Development, the Meeting agreed that the MCSD could produce added value by working in partnership with other actors, notably ICAMAS, FAO and IAMF, as well as with national expertise. BP/RAC was given a mandate to do the preparatory work establishing the necessary contacts and partnerships. It was agreed that the issue would then be taken up in depth and the network would be operational in some 18 months' time.

*Consumption patterns and urban waste management*

On consumption patterns and urban waste management, the consensus of the Meeting was that there was no need to embark on a full-scale programme immediately, but that work should be focused on building on the extensive knowledge that existed, particularly in the field of waste management, reviewing achievements to date and assessing what needed to be done in the future. The added value that the MCSD could bring to the issue would lie in networking and exchanging experience, and also in reinforcing capacities, since local authorities all too often lacked the necessary technical and financial resources. It was agreed that PAP/RAC would undertake efforts to identify partners. This would be done taking into account existing organizations, such as METAP. Progress in this respect would be reported to the Eighth Meeting of the MCSD, prior to defining a clearer orientation for the added value and expected achievements in this important area.

*Financing and cooperation for sustainable development*

Being a key issue for sustainable development in the Mediterranean Region, for which the MCSD could provide a useful contribution to the debate by serving as a legitimate forum for bringing together concerned partners for a joint reflection and to put forward relevant strategies and proposals, the Meeting decided that the theme "Financing and cooperation for sustainable development in the Mediterranean" would be launched without delay. It would proceed on the basis of the report presented by Blue Plan, supplemented by a number of considerations put forward at the Meeting, in particular the question of the mobilization of domestic resources and recourse to more appropriate international and bilateral mechanisms, such as debt swap arrangements for sustainable development projects. In order to carry out these activities, the Secretariat would seek expertise available at the regional level and in volunteer countries, and also in relevant financial organizations and among the main European and international donors from whom support was requested. A steering committee bringing together these partners would provide guidance for the studies and the preparation of the forum scheduled to be held before the Eighth Meeting of the MCSD.

Finally, in view of the fact that the issues of agricultural and rural development, consumption patterns and urban waste management and financing and cooperation for sustainable development were all new issues, the Meeting agreed that all three would be dealt with but at a different pace and at different levels, as follows: financing and cooperation as a full-scale new programme on which work would proceed immediately; consumption patterns and waste management through networking and partnerships; and agriculture and rural development by building on the work of existing institutions pending the launching of a full-scale programme.

**Major groups: Participation and contribution to MCSD activities**

The Meeting noted the information provided by the representatives of the Major groups on this subject and hoped that issues discussed in relation to ways and means for improving their participation and contribution to MCSD activities would be further elaborated at the Major Groups Forum to be held in Naples around May 2002.

**MAP/MCSD participation and contribution to the WSSD preparatory process**

Noting MAP/MCSD progress in this context, the Meeting agreed that information on the MCSD's activities and MAP should be more widely disseminated throughout the WSSD process. It was also decided that the members of the MCSD should ensure their active participation in the WSSD to promote the visibility of the region and its active contribution to sustainable development.

**Eighth MCSD Meeting**

It was noted that the Eighth Meeting of the MCSD would be held around April 2003 in Algiers. The agenda proposed in document UNEP(DEC)/MED WG.188/2 would be refined to take into account the discussions at the present meeting. Two meetings of the Steering Committee were planned before the Eighth Meeting. Finally, a two-day forum of experts on finance and cooperation for sustainable development would be held immediately prior to the MCSD meeting.

**Adoption of the report**

Following the discussions concerning the adoption of the report, the Meeting decided that the product of the MCSD's meetings would henceforth consist principally of a reasoned record of decisions preceded by a short introduction reflecting only the spirit of the discussions, the whole of which would not be longer than ten pages. The lessons to be learned from this new type of report would be drawn at the next session of the MCSD.

**ANNEX IV**  
**APPENDIX I**

**MCS D Assessment and Prospects**

**Summary of Conclusions and Recommendations**

The MCS D, having examined the report by Mr Georgiades entitled "Assessment of the Activities and Prospects of the Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development", and the suggestions contained therein, and commending the quality of the report, recalled the value of the MCS D as a forum for reflection, exchanges of view and proposals for promoting sustainable development in the Mediterranean region.

The Commission expressed its intention to propose or make the necessary improvements in response to the following concerns and objectives:

- ensuring effective involvement of all the partners concerned, in particular the socio-economic actors, based on an approach that is not exclusively environment-oriented;
- diversifying the MCS D's working methods, processes and products in a spirit of flexibility so as to enable it to respond to the wide variety of challenges and circumstances while consolidating the MCS D's role as a forum;
- having recourse to mechanisms adapted to each theme to facilitate the follow-up of recommendations at the relevant regional, national or local levels by the actors concerned;
- establishing a strategy and channels for disseminating and providing information on the results of the MCS D's activities;
- strengthening the human and financial resources allocated by the Contracting Parties to the Secretariat (Coordinating Unit and RACs) to facilitate the work of the MCS D and the fulfilment of its mission.

\*

To achieve those objectives, the MCS D recommends that the Contracting Parties:

- in nominating their representatives, ensure that they are effectively involved in sustainable development activities;
- define and adopt the profiles and tasks expected of MCS D members;
- examine the possibility of increasing the financial resources and staffing needed to support MCS D activities, both in the MAP budget and by seeking voluntary contributions;
- continue to put in place initiatives designed to promote sustainable development and increase liaison with various institutions and agencies, including national

commissions for sustainable development, and to encourage communication between them and the MCSD.

\*

In addition, the MCSD adopted the following decisions relating to its methods of work:

- The MCSD will diversify its working practices; it will adopt a specific approach for each issue identified;
- The MCSD's recommendations will be made to the actors concerned without their necessarily being adopted by the Contracting Parties;
- An effort will be made to associate intergovernmental organizations and programmes with the MCSD's work, depending on the issues, taking into account the importance of South-South cooperation;
- The Commission should be given the opportunity to become acquainted with successful initiatives in sustainable development and to encourage pilot and field projects;
- The Secretariat will strengthen the dissemination activities already undertaken using appropriate means, such as web sites, publishing a special collection and preparing a synoptic brochure outlining the MCSD's work or other documents;
- In the context of the implementation and follow-up of the MCSD's recommendations, the MCSD will organize regional and thematic workshops designed to raise awareness among the actors concerned in the countries and among partners in order to ensure that MCSD proposals are more effectively taken into account. An initial workshop on tourism as it relates to development will be organized in 2002-2003.

The Secretariat will report on the implementation of these conclusions at the Eighth Meeting.

**ANNEX V**  
**APPENDIX II**

**Opening speech of H.E Mr. Fevzi Aytekin, Minister of Environment, Turkey**

Distinguished Participants, Ladies and Gentlemen,

I would like to start by saying that I am more than pleased to host the 7<sup>th</sup> meeting of the MCSD and I would like to welcome each and everyone of you to Antalya which is a beautiful city in the Mediterranean region.

Distinguished Participants,

It is obvious that environment, one of the most important factors in international policy, will have a determinant role in the intergovernmental relationships in the coming centuries. Therefore, we observe on all international and regional platforms that the global priorities of environment and development are focused on the same issues and on the same axis. This is to some extent due to the nature of environmental problems, which do not recognize any borders, and to the fact that the problems are common, and mainly due to the fact that environment is gaining considerable importance as an element of development in the international economic relations.

Within this context, today, almost all international political and economic integration organizations, especially the UN, the Economic and Development Agency and the World Bank, are coming up with structural organizations for environment and development, and the issue of environment has become one of the fundamental factors.

The MCSD established in 1996 is of great significance since it acts for the integration of sustainable development approaches in the Mediterranean region on national and regional levels on national policies and it provides a structural framework for the formation of environment and development policies.

I believe that the Commission has a significant mission of following the priorities of the sustainable development approach, which vary according to global developments the sustainable development approach being the increasingly important issue in the international platform and being considered in almost all sectoral policies - and a mission of taking such priorities into consideration in the Mediterranean region.

Within this context, when the importance of and the necessity for such mission is considered, I would like to say that I support the discussions and activities initiated recently. Thus, this meeting is of utmost importance in terms of handling and deciding on such issues.

At this point, I would like to emphasize that it is necessary to provide financial and technical support for the changes to be made in the structure of the Commission. Therefore, it would be useful to cooperate with international finance institutions such as GEF, UNDP and World Bank. On the other hand, electing the nominees for the Secretariat is important for promoting the

activities of the Commission and for the follow-up of the decisions made. I hope and expect that this matter will be approved and put into practice as soon as possible by all the countries.

Subsequent to the promotion of the functionality of the Commission, improving cooperation with other relevant national and regional actors, international organizations and NGOs is really important for the implementation of the Commission's activities.

Distinguished Participants,

At this part of my speech, I would like to touch upon the role of a multi disciplinary regional program like MAP and MCSD in the preparatory phase of the summit to be held in Johannesburg.

As is known, the principles of sustainable development were tackled in Rio comprehensively for the first time and have been put into the form of a guide which will serve all countries by Agenda 21 which has been considered as the agenda of the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

In the Johannesburg summit, to what extent Agenda 21 and other implementation instruments adopted in Rio and afterwards have been implemented by countries to achieve their sustainable development objectives will be assessed and evaluated.

I believe the Commission's achievements and the knowledge and experience related to sustainable development will play an important role for the preparations of the summit. Furthermore, it is of great importance to reflect the decisions made after the summit to the Commission activities and to cooperate with other international organizations in this direction.

Distinguished participants,

In line with the proposal of my Ministry submitted in 1999 Bureau meeting, I would like to continue with emphasizing our request to establish a Regional Activity Centre working in the field of ecotourism in Antalya. As you all know, tourism is an important economic and social factor for communities living in the Mediterranean region; furthermore, its negative impact on natural resources and cultural assets should be taken into account.

Therefore, the issue of tourism, that should be dealt with at the level of sustainable development, should be provided with coordination and technical support to be ensured by a regional centre since tourism requires the conversion of multilateral disciplines, planned structuring on the national and regional level, research and implementation.

Within this context, I would like to underline the importance of the establishment of such a centre in Turkey which is located on three different bio -geographical regions and which has an important amount of tourism potential and pressure. I am expecting the support and suggestions of all countries in this meeting as regards the issue.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

I would like to thank and congratulate Mr. Bernard Fautrier who has chaired the Commission successfully up to date and emphasize that I am confident that Turkey will chair the Commission during the next two years in a similar successful fashion. I hope the meeting will be fruitful.

Thank you.



**ANNEX V**  
**APPENDIX I**

**Opening speech of H.E. Mr. Bernard Fautrier, Plenipotentiary Minister, Monaco**

Ladies and Gentlemen,  
Friends,

Good morning and welcome to this, the seventh meeting of the Mediterranean Commission for Sustainable Development. As you are no doubt aware, we are the guests of the Government of Turkey, and I am particularly pleased to be able to welcome to this podium my friend, His Excellency Mr. Fevzi Aytakin, Turkey's Minister for the Environment, in the company of Mr. Ertugrul Dokuzoglu, Governor of the Province of Antalya. Since so much work awaits us, I shall with no further ado hand the floor to Mr. Aytakin for his introductory speech.

Thank you for those words Mr. Minister, and thank you also for having stressed the importance of this, a crucial year, with the approaching Johannesburg Summit, and for having highlighted an issue of which your country is highly aware- tourism and its links with sustainable development. You recalled the generous offer made by your government in this respect, and the possible setting up of a centre concerning the tourism issue. As you know, this is one of the themes to be discussed in the course of our work here. With your agreement I would like now to give the floor to Mr. Lucien Chabason, Coordinator of the Mediterranean Action Plan, for a brief introduction.

\*\*\*

Thank you, Mr. Chabason, for having recalled the general outline of the route followed thus far by the Commission, and its prospects. It now falls to me to take the floor as representative of the Bureau, and President of the Bureau of the Contracting Parties.

Mr. Minister, Governor, Coordinator of MAP, Members of the Commission, Observers,

On behalf of the Bureau of the Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention, I am delighted that we are able to convene in Antalya today for this, the seventh meeting of the Mediterranean Commission for Sustainable Development.

As you know, the events which shook the entire world last autumn meant that we were unable to meet as initially planned in early October. Consequently, we were forced to hold an extraordinary meeting of the Commission in my country, so that the fruit of two years of this Commission's work could be submitted to the Contracting Parties who were due to meet in Monaco in November, as Mr. Chabason recalled a few moments ago, and so that the main lines for the coming two years could be identified.

For six years now, the MCSDD has been doing some very important work in terms of correctly understanding and ushering in genuinely sustainable development in our Mediterranean region. As Mr. Chabason also recalled, we are obviously at the beginning of a process which is of necessity going to be a slow one, possibly exceedingly slow, and which as with any human endeavour cannot be expected to be perfect from the outset. It is of course unfortunate that some of the themes dealt with by the Commission, important ones at that, and some of its recommendations have still not been adequately or clearly enough

implemented. But I do not believe that we should deduce from this that, on the one hand, the thinking which goes on in this forum is not effective and that, on the other, we should flesh out our structures in too complex a manner. In striving to overly boost the follow-up to our proposals as I see it, we should not give up our power to propose and our ability to innovate.

As you are no doubt aware, and as both the Minister and the Coordinator have recalled, we have entered a key year for sustainable development in our world, with the forthcoming Earth Summit in Johannesburg. I fully share your view, Mr. Minister, that the Mediterranean must make its voice clearly heard on that occasion through the representatives of its governments of course, but also through the representatives of its civil society. In this respect, the original make-up of the Commission provides the possibility for contact with players from within civil society, with NGOs, and with representatives of economic activities. I therefore truly hope that both the Commission and the Mediterranean Action Plan will back any initiative which may be taken in this respect by the representatives of Mediterranean civil society.

Post Johannesburg, we will no doubt have at our fingertips some elements which will put us in an even better position to draw up a genuine Mediterranean Strategy for sustainable development. As you know, this is one of the main objectives we have set for coming years, and which we are going to discuss in the course of our meeting here. If we are to succeed in this task, it is essential that we transcend the purely environmental context, and that the representatives of economic circles and of the local communities also join in and take a highly active part in our work. Only if all of these components pull together will we be really able to give some clout to our proposals, and to become genuinely involved in a sustainable development process.

One of the tasks of the Commission and for our work over the coming days, and I will conclude on this point, will also be to push ahead with work already started, and which is of particular importance to the region- I am talking here of the free trade issue- and to select some further lines of approach. I will leave it to the Commission to decide on these new lines, whilst recalling the importance of tourism issues to our region, as was stressed by Minister Aytekin. I wish you every success in your work, which you may rest assured I will be following very closely. I hope that in the very near future as far as the Bureau of the Contracting Parties is concerned we will be able to draw some lessons from your work during a meeting to be held as early as next week in Damascus.

Thank you.

**ANNEX V**  
**APPENDIX II**

**Opening speech of H.E Mr. Fevzi Aytekin, Minister of Environment, Turkey**

Distinguished Participants, Ladies and Gentlemen,

I would like to start by saying that I am more than pleased to host the 7<sup>th</sup> meeting of the MCSD and I would like to welcome each and everyone of you to Antalya which is a beautiful city in the Mediterranean region.

Distinguished Participants,

It is obvious that environment, one of the most important factors in international policy, will have a determinant role in the intergovernmental relationships in the coming centuries. Therefore, we observe on all international and regional platforms that the global priorities of environment and development are focused on the same issues and on the same axis. This is to some extent due to the nature of environmental problems, which do not recognize any borders, and to the fact that the problems are common, and mainly due to the fact that environment is gaining considerable importance as an element of development in the international economic relations.

Within this context, today, almost all international political and economic integration organizations, especially the UN, the Economic and Development Agency and the World Bank, are coming up with structural organizations for environment and development, and the issue of environment has become one of the fundamental factors.

The MCSD established in 1966 is of great significance since it acts for the integration of sustainable development approaches in the Mediterranean region on national and regional levels on national policies and it provides a structural framework for the formation of environment and development policies.

I believe that the Commission has a significant mission of following the priorities of the sustainable development approach, which vary according to global developments the sustainable development approach being the increasingly important issue in the international platform and being considered in almost all sectoral policies - and a mission of taking such priorities into consideration in the Mediterranean region.

Within this context, when the importance of and the necessity for such mission is considered, I would like to say that I support the discussions and activities initiated recently. Thus, this meeting is of utmost importance in terms of handling and deciding on such issues.

At this point, I would like to emphasize that it is necessary to provide financial and technical support for the changes to be made in the structure of the Commission. Therefore, it would be useful to cooperate with international finance institutions such as GEF, UNDP and World Bank. On the other hand, electing the nominees for the Secretariat is important for promoting the

activities of the Commission and for the follow-up of the decisions made. I hope and expect that this matter will be approved and put into practice as soon as possible by all the countries.

Subsequent to the promotion of the functionality of the Commission, improving cooperation with other relevant national and regional actors, international organizations and NGOs is really important for the implementation of the Commission's activities.

Distinguished Participants,

At this part of my speech, I would like to touch upon the role of a multi disciplinary regional program like MAP and MCSD in the preparatory phase of the summit to be held in Johannesburg.

As is known, the principles of sustainable development were tackled in Rio comprehensively for the first time and have been put into the form of a guide which will serve all countries by Agenda 21 which has been considered as the agenda of the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

In the Johannesburg summit, to what extent Agenda 21 and other implementation instruments adopted in Rio and afterwards have been implemented by countries to achieve their sustainable development objectives will be assessed and evaluated.

I believe the Commission's achievements and the knowledge and experience related to sustainable development will play an important role for the preparations of the summit. Furthermore, it is of great importance to reflect the decisions made after the summit to the Commission activities and to cooperate with other international organizations in this direction.

Distinguished participants,

In line with the proposal of my Ministry submitted in 1999 Bureau meeting, I would like to continue with emphasizing our request to establish a Regional Activity Centre working in the field of ecotourism in Antalya. As you all know, tourism is an important economic and social factor for communities living in the Mediterranean region; furthermore, its negative impact on natural resources and cultural assets should be taken into account.

Therefore, the issue of tourism, that should be dealt with at the level of sustainable development, should be provided with coordination and technical support to be ensured by a regional centre since tourism requires the conversion of multilateral disciplines, planned structuring on the national and regional level, research and implementation.

Within this context, I would like to underline the importance of the establishment of such a centre in Turkey which is located on three different bio -geographical regions and which has an important amount of tourism potential and pressure. I am expecting the support and suggestions of all countries in this meeting as regards the issue.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

I would like to thank and congratulate Mr. Bernard Fautrier who has chaired the Commission successfully up to date and emphasize that I am confident that Turkey will chair the Commission during the next two years in a similar successful fashion. I hope the meeting will be fruitful.

Thank you.

**ANNEX V**  
**APPENDIX III**

**Opening speech of Mr. Lucien Chabason, Coordinator, UNEP/MAP**

Thank you Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, President of the Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention, Governor of the Antalya Region, Members of the MCSD, observer colleagues,

Allow me first and foremost to thank Turkey for its welcome, and particularly you yourself, Mr. Minister, for the essential contribution you have made to this meeting being held in Antalya. The region of Antalya with its enormous historical and environmental wealth, symbolises well the issues of sustainable development in the Mediterranean: with such rapid urban development, the question marks which hang over the future of its agriculture and the rural nature of the amazing agricultural plains of Pamphylia, which were already famous in Antiquity; the pressure of tourism, this being, I believe, Turkey's leading tourist region; the future and enhancement of its historic heritage, the environmental stakes, and in the forefront the future of the natural areas along the coast. Basically, the Region of Antalya sums up in a nutshell the major sustainable development issues in the Mediterranean. It is therefore somewhat symbolic that we should be meeting here. Nor is this the first time that we are meeting in Antalya. Indeed, this town and this region have become one of the cult sites for the work of the Mediterranean Action Plan.

This is an important session since it is being held in the year when the second Earth Summit is due to take place in Johannesburg, and also because it comes hard on the heels of the meeting of the Contracting Parties, held four months ago in Monaco. Obviously it is important because it provides us with an opportunity to take stock and, in a sense, to sort out our ideas, our visions, and the points of view which each of us will express at the Earth Summit and in the course of its preparation. It is also important because of the agenda before it: firstly since this is an opportunity to assess the Commission's working methods, thus today's work will focus on this important matter. It also provides an opportunity to reflect upon and prepare for the launch of work on the Mediterranean Regional Strategy for sustainable development and, finally, to draw up the programme of work for the coming year; obviously our discussion of this work programme will take account of today's discussions of the Commission's methods of work. The agenda apart, I believe that the MCSD still represents an essential innovation within the Earth Summit perspective. It is the only region of the world to have set up a multi-partner cooperation instrument, within which public authorities, NGOs and socio-economic partners work jointly on an equal footing. It is a remarkable achievement. It is said that the Johannesburg Summit will encourage work at regional level, thus in a sense we will have pre-empted this desirable development.

Obviously there is still a lot to be done on various fronts in order to mobilise civil society, to further improve the quality of the MCSD's working documents, to mobilise the attention of decision-makers and stakeholders, and to implement on the ground the principles and suggestions already adopted, or still to be adopted, by the MCSD. But our ideas belong within a context, the context of the sustainable development issue, which is an extremely tricky question. The preliminary work undertaken by the international community by way of preparation for the Earth Summit shows just how tricky an issue this is. The report produced two months ago on this issue by the Secretary General of the United Nations makes no bones about the difficulty of the task. Thus, when we ask ourselves what we ourselves produce, what our own status is, this is something to be borne in mind. We are at the start of a process; sustainable development entails turning our vision on its head, and we are

making our contribution to this global movement. We are a regional component in an approach which is mobilising numerous players around the world, at global, national and local level. We must bear this context in mind as we proceed with our work. I am personally convinced that the work undertaken by the MCSD over the last five years, and which is still ongoing, provides significant input which will be put to good use in the course of preparation for the Earth Summit. Thank you.

## **ANNEX VI**

### **Major Groups contribution and perspectives within the MCSD**

#### **Preamble**

Previous, present and new members of the Major Groups of the MCSD held a consultation meeting, prior to the 7th MSCD, on the 12th of March in Antalya, Turkey.

The Objectives of this meeting were:

To assess major groups' contribution to the MCSD

To assess the methods of work and activities

To propose ways and means for improving MCSD work as well as major groups contribution to this Regional consultative forum

To elaborate prospects and define visions for the MCSD

The outcome of this meeting is submitted to the official 7th MCSD meeting held from 13-16 March 2002 in Antalya, Turkey.

#### **Introduction**

Ten years after the Rio Earth Summit for Sustainable Development and six years after its establishment, the MCSD is recognized as a unique model of regional commission bringing together governments and major groups, on equal footing ; it has been working to "bridge the gap between the desire for Sustainable Development" and its implementation in the Mediterranean Region.

Despite its contribution to translating some of the Agenda MED21 items into concrete and effective policy measures and strategic recommendations, there are still more expectations.

There is a need, at this stage, for strengthening its role and for revitalizing by the Contracting Parties the political will to translate the recommendations adopted into action oriented strategies.

#### **Perspectives and possible means for improving MCSD activities**

During the meeting, points of concern were raised regarding the selection criteria of members, the lack of effective coordination among the partners, as well as among the major groups involved. Another fact pointed out was that the weakness of the participation of some of the members in the work of the MCSD is linked, inter alia, to the reduced representation of two of the major groups (Local Authorities, Socioeconomic actors).

The improvement of the MCSD work (including the major groups) starts from the process of engagement of major group candidates. In this regard the meeting proposed the following:

The nomination process could gain in efficiency by identifying the potential candidates for the respective major groups out of the list of MAP partners (at least for the NGOs); to serve this



aim an updated and comprehensive inventory of those partners should be available.

Define a set of criteria to be fulfilled by the new candidates applying to join the MCSD to ensure the full participation of the new members.

Participation of MG in the selection process of new members, on the basis of the defined criteria - MAP partners should be admitted as observers

Have a more rational and comprehensive policy of selecting new candidates relying on existing federations of city mayors and professionals

### **Proposals to improve MCSD efficiency**

Although not exhaustive, the participants agreed to acknowledge the following issues to be considered by the MCSD.

#### **1) Major groups contribution to MCSD**

The contribution of the Major groups, based on their respective fields of expertise, could be improved through the following actions:

- by establishing a better networking system of interaction within each MG and between the different members, with the designation of a focal point for each MG on a yearly basis. This implies that a working system that enables a better coordination, is designed in such a way to improve the flow of information between the MG(s), and from the MG(s) to MCSD, through the focal points.
- by organizing briefing sessions by the Secretariat for the new members, to clarify the main issues on the agenda and the potential contribution of the MG partners in the framework of lobbying and information sharing, within the MCSD sessions and beyond them.
- by emphasizing the need for all major groups to be active in the MCSD through an effective participation in the official meetings of the MCSD and by providing inputs to the Working Groups, relevant to their respective fields of competence. The presence and involvement of all groups is of most significance.
- by developing strategic action plans for the major groups contribution to MCSD. This can be further emphasized and developed through meetings of major groups prior to official MCSD meetings. These meetings should be part of the official agenda of the MCSD meetings.
- by strengthening the staffing and budget of the MCSD secretariat for a better communication with the major groups in order to improve their contribution to the work of MCSD and to widely disseminate the recommendations.

#### **2) Other important recommendations**

- Enhance the role of regional activities centers (RACs) as technical support institutions and generate better coordination among themselves for a more effective project implementation.
- Enforce the application of the MCSD recommendations at national levels through a wider involvement of the relevant national institutions (including ministries other than the environmental) into the work of MCSD and by a more effective dissemination of the results.
- Encourage countries to develop a sustainable development culture by involving all

national relevant actors into discussions on the issues which constitute the agenda of the MCSD meetings.

- Establish a communication strategy between the MG and between the MG and CPs to be facilitated by the secretariat.

**List of attendees:**

APNEK

EDC/ICC \*

ENDA-Maghreb

FoE-Mednet

IME \*

Medcoast \*

Medforum

MIO-ECSDE

RAED

WWF \*

AIFM

MEDENER

Municipality of Calvia \*

EOAEN /observer

RAC-SPA /observer

\* endorsement